THE HISTORIANS AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

Please return this book!!

Henry V. Thomas
29 Prospect Square
Cumberland, Md.

THE HISTORIANS AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-AZF-736

THE HISTORIANS

AND THE

ENGLISH REFORMATION

BY THE

REV. JOHN STOCKTON LITTELL, M.A.

Rector of St. James' Church, Keene, N. H.

Milwaukee

THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN COMPANY

A. R. Mowbray & Co., London

1910

BR
375
.L7

Copyright by
The Young Churchman Co.
1910

FOREWORD.

When Cecil Rhodes looked beyond imperial to racial unity, he saw that it would be of advantage to all if Americans could be brought to live and study in the Mother-land. The writer of this page claims the distinction of having been a kind of Rhodes pilgrim before the Rhodes Scholarships were invented. Led by a gentle and well-wishing influence, he went to seek the advantages of interchange. And these he estimates as the main advantages of interchange: To abominate war between these kindred nations; to diminish prejudice; to promote something like a scheme of reciprocal free trade in institutions and ideals, in scholarship, in traditions, and initiative.

I have, therefore, made a collection and reprint of some results in American historical work which I ask English people to examine, and of some English scholarship that I wish to introduce to a large class of my American fellow-citizens.

My cordial thanks are here expressed to several correspondents who have so kindly answered special questions, to a number of libraries, notably in Buffalo, Brockport, Rochester, and New York City, in Boston, Concord, Middletown, and Keene, and to their most courteous and helpful custodians and assistants; to several publishers; and above all, to my good benefactors, my parents, who sent me on my pilgrimage; to the two parishes and to the household which have so patiently endured having these several years of early and late hours stolen from them for the study.

Lincoln's Birthday, February 12, 1910. J. S. L.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.—INTRODUCTORY 1

The American Teacher's Difficult Duty—A Decisive Period—Deference to History as Science—Freedom of the Citizen—Value of History—Growth of the Study—Consequent Expectation that the Difficulty will Increase—Materials, Need in the Midst of Plenty.

CHAPTER II. 11

The Influence of Hume.

CHAPTER III. 17

The Influence of Macaulay.

CHAPTER IV. 30

Froude and His Critics.

CHAPTER V. 39

Hallam, Southey, Knight, Dickens.

CHAPTER VI. 44

Freeman and His Pupils.

CHAPTER VII. 53

The Influence of Green.

CHAPTER VIII. 59

The Position of Stubbs.

CHAPTER IX. 64

Influences in the Background—Some Older Witnesses—Links Connecting the Reformers with the Period Beginning with Hume.

CHAPTER X. 80

Roman Catholic Writers: Lingard, Gasquet, Duchesne, Hefele, Acton, Cardinal Gibbons.

CHAPTER XI. 111

A Group of Lutheran, Presbyterian, and Congregational Writers.

CHAPTER XII. 115
Some American Home and Library Books.

CHAPTER XIII. 130
Some American Historians.

CHAPTER XIV. 136
Some American School Text Books.

CHAPTER XV. 187
More Recent British Authorities.

CHAPTER XVI. 245
The Scottish Reformation: Treatment Accorded by Historians, Mostly Scottish—The View from Within as a Comparison with the English.

CHAPTER XVII. 250
The Verdict of the Law.

CHAPTER XVIII. 261
Some Forgotten Documents from Roman Sources: The Declaration of 1788; The Declaration of 1826—A Forgotten Document of Presbyterian Origin—Other Testimony Not Generally Known and Allowed for: Swedish; Oriental.

CHAPTER XIX. 268
Significant Contemporary Action and Official Utterance Not Widely Known in this Country.

CHAPTER XX.—CONCLUSION 288
History a Science with Full Rights of Determination; Rights of Free Thought in Regions Indeterminate; Primary Rights of Religious Conviction; Meaning of a Free Church in a Free State.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

THE REFORMATION IN THE CLASS-ROOM—THE EQUIPMENT OF TEACHERS—THE DANGERS OF MERE TRADITION—THE DUTY OF THE TEACHER AND THE RIGHTS OF PARENT AND CHILD—THE PURPOSE AND VALUE OF HISTORY—THE RELIGIOUS FACTOR IN HISTORY—KINSHIP AND ITS RESULTS—GROWTH AND NEED OF ENGLISH HISTORICAL STUDY—AGITATION FOR CORRECT TREATMENT—DANGER IN POOR BOOKS.

It is the purpose of the present volume to meet a difficulty which regularly confronts teachers of history and teachers of religion. Minor it may seem in the brief space commonly allotted to its discussion. But it is one of those subjects in the discussion of which invariably the mind of the scholar takes on a deep impression. Somehow, a teacher's treatment of the English Reformation is one of the matters which the pupil seems to remember. The teacher is liable to meet with sharp differences of opinion, and with ideas already formed, in the minds of members of his class. A detail which can occupy but a fraction of a class-hour; a detail which is sure to come up for treatment year after year; which is variously treated by various authorities; which only a diplomat can treat without crossing the line into the territory of religious teaching forbidden by the state; which, in the preparation for teaching it, involves a vast extent of reading all out of proportion to the time allotted to it in the curriculum; is essentially a matter on which men will speak with reserve, at least until the subject has been mastered by sufficient special reading. It is, however, a topic on which one teacher's study, if made broadly and carefully, would serve as an aid to others.

In the Class Room

Equipment

There is no need of a fresh search in every case. At a time when ideal and impossible claims are made upon teachers, and there is so much to be done in every direction, there are some lines of reference-labor so settled, so perfectly certain to take recognized directions, that the authorities can be placed in a summary involving a few hours of study which will effect as much as months of eager and enthusiastic hunting and reading. The individual can be spared his labor, and at the same time be shown a group of authorities many times wider than he would be at all likely to find for himself. It cannot be expected that all teachers will go through all the authorities, great and small, with that omnivorous and tireless energy which is essential to familiarity with one of the greatest and most fruitful movements in history. At any rate, it is obvious to those who watch the results of teaching that no such care is being taken, as a rule, either in high schools or in private schools, or even in the colleges.

Let me show by an incident how easy it is for even such near relatives as British and Americans to slip a cog in telling the story of events in each other's lives. That such a thing as this could happen may be a surprise to every American, but we must, after all, recognize that we are mutual transgressors; how many American editorial writers, for instance, grasp the issues of English educational legislation? Some defective vision at such distances is almost natural, even in this era of hands across the sea.

In the spring of 1908 the English were circulating at home and in America, for the purpose of inducing interest in a "Pan Anglican" Church Congress, a paper prepared for the Congress by an English clergyman, a Master of Arts. The date of the Declaration of Independence is given as 1783[1]—the year of the cessation of hostilities and withdrawal of the British forces. The British point of view may reasonably be that our Independence may date from that year, but there is no possible point of view which would put the Decla-

[1] Stretton: *The Recent Growth*, etc. pp. 1 and 2.

ration anywhere but in the famous year of 1776. It need be no surprise if some or many American teachers, when they come to affairs so far away from their experience as the English Reformation, should be unable to give an exact, satisfactory, intelligible account of the net result. There is only one road to this achievement; that is, the mind alert, capacious, discriminating in the task of reviewing and estimating authorities and in grinding out the details. Life and interest in teaching does not come from a scant acquaintance with detail, but from the successful passing of great detail through a mind readily impressive and expressive. And nowhere in history are detail, knowledge, understanding, resource, and interest of more vital importance than in the teaching of the Reformation. Strangely, that one treatment of the matter which all along one might have desired, we have not had. We should be told what the historians say about it, that we may compare their witness: the great historians, the small historians, and the school historians. We shall need to know what is the comparative judicial value of the historians, as estimated by the critics. We shall have to look at the comparative popularity and the relative influence of the various histories used in homes, schools, and colleges. We should like to know how far small histories taken from big ones have departed, after the manner of the common gossip, from the original sources of all history; and how far, if at all, any line of histories or the injudicious kind of teachers are unconsciously spreading an influence hostile to the religious beliefs of any section of our American tax-payers.

Difficulty

For it may be stated as an accepted principle in the American school, that whatever is not determined by science, in this case whatever is not agreed upon by the best historical authorities in coincident judgment, and, being matter indeterminate, is further matter of religious controversy, is not matter for decision in the class-room. It can be further stated as an accepted principle that the only duty of a teacher in a state or civil school, in questions of this nature as they arise, is to state, as clearly

Impartiality

as can be, both sides of the question if it comes at all before the class, and that without imparting the bias or color of the teacher's own religious training or personal views. Whenever a teacher oversteps the line of propriety in making partial statements in any such matter, the teacher is clearly guilty of violating the liberty of religious views and the freedom of the citizen to hold and propagate such religion as he may desire for himself.

Liberty

Not every citizen is in the habit of watching the methods of public school teachers for the purpose of discovering infractions of this fundamental principle of American liberties. The school is in a way out of reach; we cannot, as a body of people, begin to keep up with the teachings that are communicated within its walls. But it is certain to those who for many years have made a study of this particular phase of public work, that occasionally (and that is more frequently than is right or fair), under cover of the study of music, history, literature, and sometimes also other subjects, a teacher will lecture in favor of his or her views of religion. The latest excess of this kind which has come to my notice was in a class working in psychology, where the teacher spent a portion of the time belonging to the class and the city in advocating Christian Science. The same thing is often done in history. And not infrequently, in passing the Reformation, will a teacher be found communicating to the class a feeling for or against—most frequently against—existing religious organizations having members within the class. It is only necessary to say that in some cases so pointed is the character of the remarks that the class itself recognizes the members present who are affected by the comments, and at once accords them due attention. The sensations of the pupil in such a case have been described as those of a person caught in a position of conspicuous folly or guilty of loyalty to an undeserving cause. The teacher may be conscious or unconscious of bias; the result is the same.

More definitely stated, then, these pages are intended to encourage a more faithful, a more careful and considerate treatment of a great subject. Citations will be made from

many sources. And while they may not be assumed to prove that one view is right and the other wrong, they will at least impress the teacher and the pastor with the need of caution and balance.

The demand that this should be so proceeds from motives not academic, but practical. History is not merely a study of the curious and picturesque. History is not simply an enjoyment of fascinating and stirring tales of the olden times. It is more than "a bird's-eye view of all the ungracious past." Nor is it simply one item in "an universal culture for the crowd."[2] For the past is vitally ours, and we, modern as we may be, are of and from the past. "The roots of the present lie deep in the past, and nothing in the past is dead to the man who would learn how the present came to be what it is."[3]

Political and Sociological Value of History

Our life today is a result. Effects have always their causes; and so history, because in it is the making of the present, is of practical value. The works of today are begun in the past. The men of the past were wont to act and react as do the men of today and tomorrow; the same nature meets the same appeals, and moves forward along the same lines. The practicality of history is a matter of experience. It is hard to convince people who have had no experience with history that history is at all practical; but the people who know history believe in its practical value because to them it is ever being demonstrated.

Again, all history is practical because it unfolds to us the certainty of our faith in God as our Father and in ourselves as His children. This faith is perhaps the most practical source of valuable energy which we possess, the energy of ideals both spiritual and fraternal; and this faith unfolds itself in history, and gives there the reasons why it can exist on earth. The greatest value of history is that it shows the Hand of God as He can be seen in no other way.

Religious Value of History

---

[2] Tennyson: *The Princess.*

[3] Stubbs: *Constitutional History of England,* p. 2.

> "Forever the past of the church is to us but a great curiosity-shop, into which we go to steal a bit of *bric-a-brac* which suits our fancy and which we can stick up incongruously in our modern homes, unless *out of it all there issues one great assurance that Christ has been with every soul that would receive Him* . . . . and that therefore, if we will receive Him, He will give Himself to us. When we gather from it that assurance, the past of the church becomes to us the fountain of strength and the oracle of truth."[4]

Or we may recall the confession of one of the lesser historians, a French Protestant:

"These volumes . . . . lay down in the chief and foremost place this simple and pregnant principle: *GOD IN HISTORY* . . . What is Jesus Christ, if He is not God in history?"[5]

And a greater historian says:

> "There is, I speak humbly, in common with Natural Science, in the study of living History, a gradual approximation to a consciousness that we are growing into a perception of the workings of the Almighty Ruler of the world; that we are growing able to justify the Eternal Wisdom, and by that justification to approve ourselves His children; that we are coming to see, not only in His ruling of His Church in her spiritual character, but in His overruling of the world to which His act of redemption has given a new and all-interesting character to His own people, a hand of justice and mercy, a hand of progress and order, a kind and wise disposition ever leading the world on to the better, but never forcing, and out of the evil of man's working bringing continually that which is good."[6]

So Christian history becomes one of the most sacred of all sacred studies, because it is the story of the struggle of the Holy Spirit with the hearts of men. The struggle is ever going on in modern times and in times to come; and it is of infinite value to us to know the patience of the Advocate and the certainty of His success.

> "Church History is necessarily the most inspiring and instructive of all histories. It is not only the record of the

---

[4] Phillips Brooks: *Sermons*, Second Series (*"The Candle of the Lord"*), No. 19, on *"The Accumulation of Faith"* (Ps. 78:20). P. 331.

[5] Merle d'Aubigné: *The Story of the Reformation*, Ed. of 1847, Preface, pp. 2 and 4.

[6] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Mediaeval and Modern History*, Third Edition, 1900, p. 27. Hutton: *Letters of William Stubbs*, pp. 116, 117.

lives of men aiming at the highest ideal, and living in close association for the purpose of attaining it, but of lives, both singly and collectively, enjoying special assistance from God for this purpose. It is the history of the new and more perfect Covenant between God and man. It is the history of the work of Christ leading men into all the truth of the Holy Spirit, who is His vicegerent on earth, who sanctifies His body and every member of it, and who supplies that body with special means of grace. It is the history of a divine society supported by divine instruments.

"A study of Church history is thus inevitably full of varied delight—delight in the beauty of the characters to which it introduces us, delight in the success of the truths which they have propagated, delight in the energy of eternal life of which it makes us conscious, delight in the vision which it opens to us of the second coming of the Lord, and of His reign of truth and peace. It has manifestly its complement of pain and disappointment, of anxiety and fear. This dark shadow will fall upon us, and chill us more sadly, in proportion to our own growth in holiness and our own sense of the grandeur of the Church's mission and our love of the cause of God which it is designed to serve. We should be wanting in true sympathy if we did not feel this pain severely. But we must not allow fear to triumph over hope. Our Lord's forecasts have prepared His disciples for such disappointments, and the pain which we experience is salutary. It does not lead us to doubt the reality of the visible Church; but it makes us acknowledge its incompleteness." [7]

A word now in reference to our present topic, and the wider range of all English History, in its relation to American:

Kinship: Its Claim

It so happens that we Americans are inheritors of English speech and English law and English freedom. We are the inheritors and descendants of English religion. We need to know something about that religion because it is, by reason of our origin, our religion. It is a part of our nature to be intensely interested in anything which concerns our own life during the ages when it lay hid in the life of our Mother Country.

---

[7] John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury: *The Ministry of Grace*, 1901, pp. 1 and 2. And "History is the true demonstration of religion," Acton, *Letters to Mary Gladstone*, p. 78, and on p. 86, "The history of religion lies near the heart of all history."

We are today at a very productive point in a long and honored line of historians of England. The interest taken by Americans in English history is great and growing. A committee of seven appointed in 1896 by the American Historical Association reported that the study of history other than United States History is on the increase, and gave also a broad statement of its necessity and usefulness. "English History until 1776 is our History." "Any argument in favor of American History, therefore, holds almost equally true for the study of English history."[8]

Growth and Need

> "English history, coming in the third year of the school course, and completing the survey of European development, is exceedingly important. Significant as is the history of the English Nation in itself, the study may be made doubly useful if the work is so conducted that it seems in some measure as a review of continental history and as a preparation for American history. The pupils in our schools can ill afford to lose such an introduction to the study of the history and institutions of the United States; for without a knowledge of how the English people developed and English principles matured, they can have slight appreciation of what America means." [9]
>
> "If an Englishman cannot write without prejudice about the Rebellion and the Commonwealth, much less can an American. But it is, I take it, a misfortune that the earlier English history has not received its share of attention in the United States. Very much of English life was ripe when it was transplanted thither, and belongs as much almost to them as to ourselves. . . . . I conceive that this is being amended. . . . . We know that we are kinsfolk, that we have thirteen centuries of common Christian History and culture. . . . . We may hope that with a fair acquaintance with one another we may diverge no more widely and never have to be ashamed of our connection." [10]

The growth of this work in twenty years can best be appreciated by quoting the words of a guide to American Students:

> "Within the last few years, the study of history has received a new and vigorous impulse. . . . . Where but a

[8] Am. Hist. Assoc.: *The Study of History in Schools*, 1899 and 1904, p. 36.

[9] The same, p. 67.

[10] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures*, p. 79.

> few years ago a single tired instructor taught history only as a work of charity, we now see a number of teachers zealously devoting their entire energies to the study and the teaching of history alone . . . . the study of history and the use of historical methods are to be noted among the striking and growing characteristics of present intellectual activity." [11]

The writer finds understanding of Christianity sufficient for most practical purposes in a study of its primary documents. But as an American, willing to comprehend our social and religious conditions, our manners, morals, education, and institutions, he acknowledges that a flood of light comes to the mind of anyone who will make himself familiar with that crisis of what we may justly call our history, known as the English Reformation. Especially is this a necessity if one would at all comprehend the liberties and the limits of our religious life

Nothing is more remarkable than the diversity shown by the historians, great and small, in approaching the Reformation period and coming away from it. It is the purpose of the present volume to show, by brief but sufficient quotations, what is the estimate placed by all the most widely read and studied histories upon this event so fruitful in effects upon our present-day living and feeling.

We find that the question, "What was the issue of the Reformation?" is continually being raised in American communities. Within the past three years I have had personal knowledge that the question has been raised in our cities to the number of at least a score. To give instances: In New Orleans a speaker at a public meeting surprised his audience by what appeared to them a new account of the precise effects of the life and policy of Henry VIII. About the same time a club of ministers in Minneapolis decided to review the character of the English History being taught in the local schools. Later, in June, 1908, in Colorado, a committee was chosen to look up the chief text-books in public use, "to make such representations to the

Agitation for Correct Statements

[11] Prof. C. K. Adams: *A Manual of Historical Literature*, 1889; pp. 1 and 2.

educational authorities as will rectify the matter" of "inaccurate statements" "taught to our children" and "an incorrect impression concerning" some important matters connected with Reformation history; because "the aim of our age is to arrive at a precise knowledge of the truth." The following December a similar movement appeared in Illinois, and in 1909 it was publicly discussed in religious conventions in Connecticut and New Hampshire. I have followed the matter of the Reformation History in Canada and England, also for some years, and I am sure it may safely be said that there is not a week in the year when this question does not arise.

Danger in Poor Books

From all that has gone before it will be seen that the question which we have before us is of the persistent rather than of the burning kind, though when it arises from time to time there is not absent the element of fire. In any case, knowledge through investigation of authorities is the teacher's duty and privilege. The pages to follow furnish the results—on both sides—of an investigation which would require months, if not years, of the teacher's spare time. And we must begin a long way back.

As we enter this region of investigation, we cannot do better than set before ourselves the warning:

"I cannot help thinking that, although sound historical books find a hearty welcome for the most part, unsound and sensational books, which pretend to the character of history, are too often welcomed quite as heartily."[12]

[12] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures*, p. 58.

CHAPTER II.

HUME.

HUME'S STATEMENTS—HUME'S CRITICS—A NEW RELIGION.

Hume died in the first year of American Independence. For nearly a century his history held a position of priority in influence. His views of the effect of the English Reformation may be inferred from expressions such as these:

> Under Henry VIII.: "All the measures of the king and parliament led to a breach with the church of Rome, and to an alteration of religion." "Henry, in conjunction with the great council of the nation, proceeded still in those gradual and secure steps, by which they loosened their connections with the See of Rome, and repressed the usurpations of the Roman pontiff." "Henry proceeded with so much order and tranquillity in changing the national religion." "To change the religion of a country, even when seconded by a party, is one of the most perilous enterprises which any sovereign can attempt." "The ancient and almost uninterrupted opposition of interests between the laity and clergy in England, and between the English clergy and the court of Rome, had sufficiently prepared the nation for a breach with the sovereign pontiff." He speaks of "those numerous inventions which the interested spirit of the Roman pontiff had introduced into religion . . . . the reformers proceeded thence to dispute concerning the nature of the sacraments, the operations of grace, the terms of acceptance with the Deity"; and we find as a result, "new doctrines" and "the two religions." "Separate as he stood from the Catholic church and from the Roman pontiff, the head of it, he still valued himself on maintaining the Catholic doctrines." "Henry laboured incessantly by arguments, creeds, and penal statutes, to bring his subjects to a uniformity in their religious sentiments." "The abolition of the ancient religion

much contributed to the regular execution of justice. While the Catholic superstition subsisted, there was no possibility of punishing any crime in the clergy."

Under Edward VI.: "All men foresaw . . . . the total abolition of the Catholic faith in England"; "few members of the council seemed to retain any attachment to the Roman communion. The riches which most of them had acquired from the spoils of the clergy, induced them to widen the breach between England and Rome; and by establishing a contrariety of speculative tenets, as well as of discipline and worship, to render a coalition with the mother church altogether impracticable." He speaks of "the numerous and burdensome superstitions with which the Romish church was loaded." "But as the reformers pretended in some few particulars to encourage private judgment in the laity, the translation of the liturgy, as well as of the Scriptures, into the vulgar tongue, seemed more conformable to the genius of their sect; and this innovation, with the retrenching of prayers to saints, and of some superstitious ceremonies, was the chief difference between the old mass and the new liturgy." On Hume's showing, if this were all of a change, consisting primarily of translation from an old language to a new, it would hardly appear to justify such a name as "new liturgy," still less "new religion." Nor this: "The principal tenets and practices of the Catholic religion were now abolished."

Mary "still continued to adhere to the mass, and to reject the new liturgy." St. Augustine "and the other ancient doctors would convince her of the errors of the Romish superstition." "The mass was everywhere reëstablished." This was a "violent and sudden change of religion." There had been "severe punishments against all exercise of the Catholic worship," and now reversed conditions "rendered the Catholic religion the object of general detestation." "The burning of heretics was a very natural method of reconciling the Kingdom to the Romish communion."[1]

Hume is an adept in variety for nomenclature. For one side he uses "the Catholic religion," "the ancient faith," "the Romish church," "the Catholic faith," "the ancient superstition," "the ancient worship," and "the Catholic superstition," all within a few pages. Elizabeth favored "some preachers of her own sect" which was "the Protestant re-

[1] Hume: *The History of England*, Chaps. 30 to 37. Boston. Edition of 1854, Vol. 3, pp. 189, 191, 199, 201, 202, 203, 278, 311, 325, 350, 351, 369, 400, 419, 426.

ligion," for "thus . . . . was the whole system of religion altered."[2]

Hume's estimate of the total effect of the English Reformation is summed up in these words:

> "Of all the European churches which shook off the yoke of papal authority, no one proceeded with so much reason and moderation as the church of England; an advantage which had been derived partly from the gradual and slow steps by which the reformation was conducted in that kingdom. Rage and animosity against the Catholic religion was as little indulged as could be supposed in such a revolution: the fabric of the secular hierarchy was maintained entire: the ancient liturgy was preserved, so far as was thought consistent with the new principles: many ceremonies, become venerable from age and preceding use, were retained: the splendor of the Romish worship, though removed, had at last given place to order and decency: the distinctive habits of the clergy, according to their different ranks, were continued: no innovation was admitted merely from spite and the opposition to former usage; and the new religion, by mitigating the genius of the ancient superstition, and rendering it more compatible with the people and interests of society, had preserved itself in that happy medium which wise men have always sought, and which the people have so seldom been able to maintain." [3]

It is worth noting that Hume, with all his expressions about the new and the old religion, does not say anything about a new nor an old *Church.* As he looks at it, the movement occurred within the old Church just as it occurred within the nation, and an old Church could apparently adopt a new religion without loss of its identity. Shaking off the Papal yoke was the act of the Church of England. He sees but one Church in England, and within the old Church he sees a new religion substituted for an ancient superstition. One quotation which we have used shows that Hume did not entirely overlook (though his references thereto are scanty) the aim of the Church of England to return to the Scriptures of the Bible and to the ancient Creeds. In what sense, then, was the religion of the Church of England *new?* We can only think of his meaning in a relative sense, that it was

---

[2] Same: Chap. 38. Vol. 4, pp. 4, 5, 6, 10.
[3] Same: Chap. 40. Vol. 4, p. 115.

practically new to the people of the times. Bible and Creed had become eclipsed by other considerations. Astronomers announce a new star, and analysis finds a new element; in the summer people travel to new scenes, and come back to work new men and new women. Star and element have been in existence for countless ages; the scenes for years; even the men and women have been growing old. The newness is all in the perception. The new world is really just as old as the rest of the globe. The readers of Hume must bear in mind that the historian was not unaware of the return of the Church of England to primitive Christianity. When he said "the new religion" he meant that it came home with new and unfamiliar force to the minds and hearts of that day. "The ancient superstition" had grown in upon the original faith; and the original faith came back like new. And this took place within the Church of England.

Langton's appointment (A. D. 1207) Hume describes as an "encroachment of the Romish see," and records how the Pope "annulled" Magna Charta on the ground that it was "unjust . . . . and derogatory to the dignity" of Rome; how the English retorted age after age with confirmations of the charter.[4]

We should now examine Hume's record as it has been made out by his critics and reviewers. Hallam attacks him for some minor errors.[5] The late Professor George P. Fisher of Yale University, says: "Hume's negligence in examining and reporting authorities, his inaccuracy, his partiality for the Stuarts, and his frigid tone with regard to questions of morals and religion, are now conceded."[6]

Prof. Fisher

Hume himself says that his history was received with "reproach, disapprobation, and even detestation" because he had "presumed to shed a generous tear for the fate of Charles I. and the Earl of Strafford." The Primate of England and the Primate of Ireland alone wrote him words of encouragement. The in-

Moulton

[4] Hume: *History*, Ch. 8, par. 7, and foll.

[5] Hallam: *Constitutional History of England*, Vol. 1, pp. 193 (note) 203, 205 (note), 208 (note), and 64.

[6] Fisher: *The Reformation*. p. 494. 1902, Vol. 3.

scription on Hume's tomb contains no eulogy, but the words "Leaving it to posterity to add the rest."

Let us now see what posterity has offered. Of the forty-one criticisms cited in Moulton, twenty-one accuse Hume of inaccuracy or partiality, while five give him credit for accurate narrative or impartial judgment. Two brief sentences are worth quoting from his most modern critics who had the advantage of all that went before. Professor Saintsbury in 1896 wrote: "The old accusations against its partisanship are ridiculous. Hume's Toryism did not lead him nearly so far from absolute impartiality as Lingard's 'Popery,' as Macaulay's Whiggishness, as Mr. Green's neo-Liberalism; and he compensated it by a sort of transcendence of humour which, unfortunately, none of these three shared." Edmund Gosse in 1897 wrote: "Modern critics have shown that Hume's pages swarm with inaccuracies, and that, what is a worse fault, his predilections for Tory ideas lead him to do wilful injustice to the opponents of arbitrary power." And another says: Hume's "political principles led him to exalt the royal prerogative, his philosophic opinions forced him to depress the Church." [7]

For the sake of completeness we might take up at this point the history known as the *Student's Hume*. We find most of Hume's expressions as given, with this:

> "The year 1534 may be considered as the era of the separation of the English Church from Rome." [8] "The mass, which had always been celebrated in Latin, was translated into English, and this innovation, with the retrenching of prayers to saints, and of some superstitious ceremonies, was the chief difference between the old mass and the new liturgy. The doctrine of the real presence was tacitly condemned by the new Communion service,[9] but still retained some hold in the minds of men. Thus the principal tenets and practices of the Catholic religion were now abolished." The editor speaks of "the reëstablishment of the usurpation and idolatry of the Church of Rome" as a possibility if Mary should succeed Edward. And "All Mary's acts showed that she was determined to restore the Roman Catholic religion."

---

[7] Moulton: *The Library of Literary Criticism.* 1902, Vol. 3, pp. 655, 649.

[8] *Student's Hume,* Chap. 15, par. 2.

[9] This is certainly an error, as will appear later. Pp. 73, 214, *ff.*

"Bishops and priests were encouraged in their forwardness to revive the Mass." "The Mass was everywhere reëstablished." "In one session, without any violence, tumult, or clamour, was the system of religion altered." "A law was also passed that the Jesuits and Popish priests should depart the kingdom within forty days; and the exercise of the Catholic religion, which had formerly been prohibited under lighter penalties, was totally suppressed."[10]

Before Hume's History (pub. 1754) came Burnet's in 1679, and Milton's in 1670. The Burnet, while "a projectile fired in defence of the Protestant interests," asserts the continuity of the Church of England. It is "fair and clear, and supported by documents."[11]

---

[10] *Student's Hume,* Chap. 16, par. 6 and 11; Chap. 17, par. 2 and 3; Chap. 18, par. 1 and 17.

[11] Prof. A. J. Grant (Leeds U.): *English Historians,* 1906, p. xxiv. Burnet's book is called *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England,* in which Continuity is asserted in Dedication, p. xxix; and Vol. II., p. 374, Prof. Nares' ed., 1842. Nares had the chair of Modern History at Oxford. There is a good article on Burnet in the *Church Times,* London, 29 May, 1908.

CHAPTER III.

MACAULAY AND HIS CRITICS.

HIS STATEMENTS IN THE HISTORY—IN THE ESSAYS—HIS FIRST CRITIC—HIS EARLY POPULARITY—HIS INFLUENCE—PRAISE BY FORMER-PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT—CRITICISM BY LORD ACTON—MR. GLADSTONE—PRESIDENT ROUTH OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE.—MR. GEORGE BIRKBECK HILL—PROFESSOR COLLINS—MR. LECKY—PROFESSOR JOHN FISKE—THE REVIEWS—BISHOP JOHN WILLIAMS—BISHOP STUBBS—J. COTTER MORRISON—PETER BAYNE—LORD MORLEY—THE REVIEWS—WALTER BAGEHOT—THREE OTHERS—PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON OF PRINCETON—PROFESSOR FREEMAN—NECESSITY OF THIS RECORD OF EXTENDED CRITICISM.

Now let us take Macaulay, and begin in his first chapter. He refers to English pre-Reformation Christians as "of the Latin Communion"; the Church to which they belong as "the Church of Rome"; "the Roman Catholic system." "It is difficult to say whether England owes more to the Roman Catholic religion or to the Reformation." "Henry VIII. attempted to constitute an Anglican Church different from the Roman Catholic Church on one point alone. His success in this attempt was extraordinary. . . . . But Henry's system died with him."[1]

Macaulay's Words

Macaulay speaks of the "founders" of the Church of England as of the time of the Reformation.[2] And again he says:

> "A union (between government and the Protestants) was effected, and the fruit of that union was the Church of England." He speaks of "the alliance which produced the Anglican Church"; and "the compromise from which she

[1] Macaulay: *The History of England,* etc. Harper's Ed. of 1879, Vol. 1, pp. 32, 55, 56.

[2] Macaulay: *Essays,* Vol. 1, *Hallam.* Ed. N. Y., 1877, pp. 453, 454. Vol. 4, *Gladstone,* p. 174.

> sprang"; of "the founders of the Anglican Church"; that "the Church of England . . . . copied the Roman Catholic forms of prayer"; that "the Irish were the only people who had remained true to the old religion"; and that "the founders of the Anglican Church had retained episcopacy." [3]

Lord Morley has again brought to attention one of the most extreme of Macaulay's statements: "I remember what we have taken from the Roman Catholics."[4] He is speaking of property now used for education. But if college property was taken from Roman Catholics, it would be argued by most persons that Church property also was taken from Roman Catholics and given to others. The words seem to involve the present equipments of the English Church so far as they existed prior to the Reformation. The reader may judge whether this interpretation coincides with the other expressions quoted from Macaulay. We are on the whole justified in taking Macaulay for an authority for the idea that at the Reformation the old Church was banished and in its stead a new Church was founded.

This is Macaulay's theory.

But what do people think of Macaulay?

A Daring Critic

The statements which I have quoted drew a protest, and they were among the first statements, if not the very first, to be challenged. The critic in this instance was the Bishop of Exeter. But what is a Bishop against a Macaulay? For it must be remembered that Macaulay's History, at the time of its publication, was hailed by the literary world with a shout of delight. No such history had ever been written. Edition succeeded edition, on both sides of the great water. People speculated and wrote about the fabulous profits of the publishers. The author expanded with pride under the genial influence of unexpected pecuniary reward, not to mention his well-deserved fame. It was said that everyone who could read was reading Macaulay. Even to this day you may gather your evidence of the remaining force of the vogue. In American homes, especially out of the cities and towns, and in places

[3] Macaulay: *History*, as above. Vol. 1, pp. 57, 58, 59, 72, and 79.
[4] Morley: *Life of Gladstone*, 1903, Vol. 1, p. 270.

where you would not quite expect it, where a family will keep but a very small library in a single small case, you will find they have their Macaulay, often the only visible volume of foreign history.

For over half a century the influence of this book in its field has been supreme. I will presently return to this condition, as it is a factor in our mental-religious constitution. But what is the real place of Macaulay in history? Certainly it is not the rank as now and formerly accepted.

Critics of Macaulay

Amongst authors of repute it is possible to find few who would venture to commend Macaulay for reliability. Even the exalted position of a President of the United States, and the immense popularity of a Roosevelt, would not assure infallibility, nor induce his most ardent friends to expect his freedom from error of judgment in a historical matter. For he stands almost alone in the kind of eulogy which he bestows upon Macaulay. He speaks of "Macaulay, with his eminently sane and wholesome spirit," and this stands out against a vigorous assault upon the "gnarled genius" of Carlyle, who is said "deliberately to invert the truth." [5] Mr. Roosevelt's estimate of Macaulay represents, as we shall see, a large constituency of opinion which needs to square itself with the final judgment of experts.

The late Lord Acton, who was Regius Professor of Modern History in Cambridge University, gives us this criticism of Macaulay:

> "Burke and Macaulay constantly represented the statesmen of the revolution as the legitimate ancestors of modern liberty. It is humiliating to trace a political lineage to Algernon Sidney, who was the paid agent of the French King; to Lord Russell, who opposed religious toleration at least as much as absolute monarchy; to Shaftesbury, who dipped his hands in the innocent blood shed by the perjury of Titus Oates; to Halifax, who insisted that the plot must be supported, even if untrue; to Marlborough, who sent his comrades to perish on an expedition which he had betrayed to the French; to Locke, whose notion of liberty involves

[5] Roosevelt: *Oliver Cromwell.* Written while former President Roosevelt was Governor of the State of New York. 1900. Pp. 1, 2-4, 140.

nothing more spiritual than the security of property, and is consistent with slavery and persecution." [6]

As early as 1826, Mr. Gladstone recorded a judgment on Macaulay. He says he has been reading

> "a most violent attack on Milton by Macaulay, fair and unfair, clever and silly, allegorical and bombastic, republican and anti-episcopal—a strange composition, indeed." [7]

Just half a century later, in July, 1876, Mr. Gladstone wrote:

Gladstone on Macaulay

> "He was (as has been variously shown) often inaccurate . . . . recollections of character, of feelings, of opinions; of the intrinsic nature, details, and bearings of occurrences . . . . here it was that Macaulay's wealth was unto him an occasion of falling . . . . the possessor of so powerful a fancy could not but illuminate with the colours it supplied the matters which he gathered into his great magazine, wherever the definiteness of their outline was not so rigid as to defy or disarm the action of the intruding and falsifying faculty. Imagination . . . might seriously or even fundamentally disturb the balance of light and dark in his opinions of Milton or of Laud. . . . . Hence arose, it seems reasonable to believe, that charge of partisanship against Macaulay as an historian, on which much has been, and probably much more will be, said. He may not have possessed that scrupulously tender sense of obligation, that nice tact of exact justice, which is among the very rarest, as well as the most precious, of human virtues. But there never was a writer less capable of intentional unfairness. This during his lifetime was the belief of his friends, but was hardly admitted by opponents. His biographer has really lifted the question out of the range of controversy. He wrote for truth; but, of course, for truth such as he saw it; and his sight was coloured from within." . . . . "Weight, breadth, proportion, deep discernment, habitual contemplation of the springs of character and conduct, and the power to hold the scales of human action with firm and even hand; these . . . . are rarely observable in Macaulay." [8]

Mr. Gladstone gives twenty pages of this review to a discussion of some fifteen cases of historical injustice, some of which had abundantly been proven against Macaulay.

---

[6] Acton: *History of Freedom*, etc., p. 53.
[7] Morley: *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. 1, p. 33.
[8] Gladstone: *Gleanings of Past Years*, Vol. 2, pp. 290, 291, 292, 298, 299, 315-331, and 339, especially p. 318, par. 72.

From this same paper, Lord Morley cites as follows:

> "Mr. Gladstone wrote in 1876, in a highly interesting parallel between Carlyle and Macaulay—both of them honest, he said, both, notwithstanding their honesty, partisans; both of them poets using the vehicle of prose; both having the power of painting portraits extraordinary for vividness and strength; each of them vastly though diversely powerful in expression, each more powerful in expression than in thought; neither of them to be resorted to for comprehensive disquisition, nor for balanced and impartial judgments."[9]

And, fifteen years later, for Macaulay seems to have been to Mr. Gladstone almost literally a life-long study and interest, and his judgment spans just sixty-five years:

"Macaulay is so caught by a picture, by colour, by surface, that he is seldom to be counted on for a just account of motive."[10]

Nor is this all. For reasons connected with his vogue and popularity of which we will give an idea later on, it will be necessary, solely to meet the vast influence of Macaulay, to pile up these criticisms, as certainly they cannot be piled up against any other historian.

Dean Burgon preserves a letter from a fellow of Merton College, Edmund Hobhouse, sometime Bishop of Nelson, in which is the following passage: "I called on the venerable Routh the day after he entered his 95th year, ... and found him full of Macaulay. He thinks M. is too 'one-sided a gentleman' to hold high rank as a historian. He disproved, from documents in his possession"—then follow several items in Magdalen College and Oxford University affairs in which Macaulay is accused of having suppressed facts bearing on the character of James II. and Charles I., with the intention of making the characters look "blacker."[11]

Short Criticisms

This gentle verdict of a great English Churchman and educator may be set beside the outspoken comment of a reviewer: "Of Laud especially the historical estimate has changed entirely from Macaulay's ridiculous and spiteful

[9] Morley: *Life of Gladstone,* Vol. 3, p. 98.

[10] The same: P. 425. *Anno.* 1891.

[11] Burgon: *Lives of Twelve Good Men,* 1888, pp. 41 and 42. Compare Macleane: *Our Island Church,* 1909, p. 85, on "The Crowning of Our Kings."

caricature."[12] George Birkbeck Hill warns us of "Lord Macaulay's wild and wanton rhetoric" and spreads his indictment over ten pages.[13] Professor Collins, now Bishop of Gibraltar, says: "The historian may not adopt a purely partisan position and see his facts through a lens which at once distorts and colors them, like Macaulay."[14] The historian Lecky is another on record showing how Macaulay violates truthfulness.[15] And, to come home, Professor John Fiske speaks of the historian as "the prejudiced and impulsive Macaulay," says his attempts at reply to certain criticisms left him "in a very sorry plight," and shows his confusion of two men different in kind as a blunder. The whole passage is well worth reading.[16]

It should be understood that this error of Macaulay's is no discovery of Fiske's. It was first exploited in 1858 in English and American publications, and defended in 1865, was taken up again in 1868, and two books were issued bearing upon the subject.

Bishop John Williams of Connecticut took Macaulay to task for drawing false inferences from an utterance of Cranmer's.[17] And Bishop Stubbs says:

> "How can we recommend the man who wants to get up the rights of a case to a history like Macaulay's? How easy must have been the victory of Macaulay's hero if all his adversaries were the pitiful knaves and fools that they appear to him to have been. I am not calling him a slanderer, I do not believe that he was one; or ignorant or careless, for he was most learned and accurate; nor insincere, for he was most sincere; but for all that he was a party writer."[18]
>
> Stubbs

It will be noticed that most, if not all, of the criticisms of Macaulay's work already presented are cited not from what

---

[12] *The Church Times*, London, 5 June, 1908, p. 762. Macaulay: *Essays, Hallam*, last in Vol. 1, and Vol. 3, pp. 510-521.

[13] Hill: *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, 1891, Preface, p. xx. See also the "astounding blunder" of Macaulay in Hill: *Talks About Autographs*, pp. 37 and 38, and another in the same, pp. 117 and 118.

[14] W. E. Collins: *The Study of Ecclesiastical History*, p. 25.

[15] Lecky: *Historical and Political Essays*, 1908, pp. 5 and 6.

[16] Fiske: *Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America*, Ed. of 1903, Vol. 2, pp. 285-287, 290.

[17] Williams: *Paddock Lectures* for 1881, "The English Reformation," pp. 71-74.

[18] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures*, p. 124.

may properly be connected with the literature of criticism, but are dropped by the way in the pursuit of some other matter into which Macaulay's habitual bias forces itself in the character of the horrible example. It counts for the equivalent of involuntary testimony before the courts. We will now give some longer extracts from articles written for the direct purpose of criticism of an expert and professional type. The two kinds of criticism go together. Their joint force, when they agree, as in this case, is more than double.

One biographer says:

> "Macaulay belongs to a class of writers whom critics do not always approach with sufficient circumspection and diffidence—the class, namely, of writers whose merits and defects appear to be so obvious that there is no mistaking them . . . . something like a reaction against Macaulay's fame has recently set in." "It is vexatious to be forced to add that the historical fidelity of the fine *Essay on Warren Hastings* is in many places open to more than suspicion. A son of the Chief-justice of Bengal has shown that Macaulay has been guilty at least of very reckless statements. He was not, one likes to think, intentionally and wittingly unfair; but he was liable to become inebriated with his own rhetoric till he lost the power of weighing evidence. The old superstitious belief in Macaulay's accuracy is a creed of the past." [19]

Peter Bayne, a Scot, who edited two papers in Glasgow and two in London, has an essay on Macaulay in which he says, first, that Macaulay is wrong in attributing the permanence of religious influences to cold material causes; then: "This fatal defect in Mr. Macaulay's religious views vitiates his opinions on two subjects," . . . "on the great religious revolution of the Sixteenth century, and the *Pilgrim's Progress* of Bunyan."[20]

Lord Morley's name we have already used in bringing out the judgment of Gladstone, and also as editor of Macaulay's *Life,* and we could not do better than notice the settled character of his own opinion.

About thirty-three years ago John Morley, now Lord

---

[19] J. Cotter Morison: *Life of Macaulay* in the Series *English Men of Letters,* edited by Lord Morley, pp. 38, 39, 82, and 83, note.

[20] In *Essays in Biography and Criticism,* Boston Edition, 1858, Second Series, p. 64.

Morley and Secretary for India in the British Ministry, wrote a brilliant and learned essay on Macaulay, which is in fact an indictment. He shows that Macaulay's historical example was bad; that he set a bad precedent for historical writers in general.

> "Macaulay tempted more of them to declaim . . . . did much to encourage oracular arrogance, and a rather too thrasonical complacency . . . . trained a taste for . . . . all the paraphernalia of the pseudo-picturesque." Morley does the historian entire justice, recognizes and acclaims his genius. As he says, he is not writing "to disparage his genius, but to classify it." [21]

It is obvious that Mr. Morley did not intend to have Macaulay classified as a good and impartial historian. But no question can be raised on the point of popularity. For Mr. Morley again wrote: "Macaulay made thousands read history who before had turned from it as dry and repulsive." In this lies his gift; not in judicial fairness. His own age was amazed at his popularity.

> "Seven years have elapsed," said a London correspondent, "since Macaulay produced the first two volumes of what the wags call his story, and what the grave ones don't call history. Whatever it may be called, its name smells exceedingly sweet in the nostrils of its publishers, ... who have published an edition of nobody but themselves knows how many thousands, nearly every year since. . . . The metropolitan subscription has, doubtless, by this time, exceeded 10,000, which, at the lowest possible calculation, would leave a clear profit of £6,000." . . . One library took 2,700; "think of that for a circulating library—upwards of £3,000 for a supply of one book!" . . . "There will be 30,000 copies disposed of in 1856." . . . "Up to Saturday the London subscription alone had reached 20,000 copies, and 14,000 for the provinces—total, 34,000 copies; and the list not closed yet . . . . The cost to the public of these 40,000 copies, ... would be £72,000. Placed side by side, the books would extend more than two miles and a half . . . . piled one upon another, as if St. Paul's Cathedral, the monument, Pompey's Pillar, and the great Pyramid were all placed one upon another, their height would not amount to

Macaulay's Popularity

---

[21] *Littell's Living Age,* Boston, 20 May, 1876, p. 48. Macaulay had been dead seventeen years.

more than a tenth of that of the books." Thus did the age outpour its amazement.[22] *Blackwood's* said: "No history, we suppose, ever written or published, pretending to be a history, and not a romance or a poem, has ever reached or approached the extent of popularity attained by Mr. Macaulay. A book which has been read by almost every person in the three kingdoms pretending to intelligence, canvassed by almost every periodical which ever touches upon literature, and discussed in every circle where books are loved or known —must be something of different mettle from those histories which we have all read under pressure of conscience as a duty or a necessity." But "Mr. Macaulay utters a deliverance on the most inadequate grounds, accepts unworthy testimony, falls into serious errors, and makes no attempt to correct the same."[23] The *Athenaeum* said: "In closing these volumes . . . . we must record our impression of them as a whole: They have great beauties and great defects. They are unusually copious in knowledge and in utterance. They are exciting, various, and eminently pictorial. They are also full of prejudice—personal prejudice and party prejudice. In many parts they are hasty in judgment as well as passionate in expression. Many will object to characters and passages—and there is more than one excessively rancorous attempt to blacken a bright reputation. Yet, with all their defects, these volumes are a fine addition to our library—the greatest historical work of our generation."[24] The *Quarterly Review* said "The time has come when we feel bound to enter a firm protest against a species of hero-worship which cannot fail to demoralize and discredit the republic of letters, if it spreads. The worshippers at the Macaulay shrine will not rest satisfied with the ready, nay eager, recognition of their idol as the most brilliant and popular essayist and historian of the age. They peremptorily insist on his infallibility. There is to be no appeal from his judgments . . . ."

The Reviews on Macaulay

"When a lady asked Dr. Johnson how he came to commit a palpable blunder in his *Dictionary,* he replied: 'Ignorance, Ma'am, pure ignorance.' Lord Macaulay was never seduced into such a display of frankness, although he could have afforded it equally well. It was a point of honour with him never to admit an error; and his disciples manfully maintain to this hour that he never was guilty of one. There has been enough of this. . . . . Almost all readers feel the charm

[22] *Littell's Living Age,* Boston, 8 Dec., 1855, p. 597.
[23] Same, 1 Nov., 1856, pp. 257, 258.
[24] Same, 16 Feb., 1856, p. 426.

> of Lord Macaulay's eloquence—of his rich imagination, his descriptive powers, his gorgeous rhetoric, his glow, grasp, and comprehensiveness—but very few care to inquire about the evidence upon which his splendid declamations rest. Examination of evidence in a critical spirit is to most persons repulsive, and it is always difficult to undertake the support of reasoned truth against eloquent sentiment. We have, moreover, to contend . . . against an established admiration, which in many minds rises to something like a religious sentiment. . . . . The time can hardly come when his picturesque and luminous pages will cease to be devoured with avidity by the most intellectual and impressible class of readers; and those, above all others, should be forewarned that a most attractive and instructive companion may prove a very unsafe counsellor or guide." [25]

As far back as 1849 a notice in the *Quarterly Review,* in face of the avalanche of success and the universal shout of delight with which Macaulay's historical works were then being received, dared to say: "The work, we apprehend, will hardly find a permanent place on the historical shelf—nor ever, assuredly . . . . be quoted as authority on any question or point of the History of England."

This provoked a reply from the *Edinburgh Review,* which after a vigorous and lengthened defence of his accuracy, admits "one fault which strikes us as important . . . His talent for description sometimes gets the better of him; and although he neither invents nor imagines incidents, it now and then happens that he loads a fact with more inferences and accessories than it can easily sustain." For this magazine Macaulay himself was a reviewer, and the defence is partly friendship; the admission is of the greater value. Twenty-seven years later, *Cornhill Magazine* said: "There is something in the absolute confidence of Macaulay's political dogmatism which varies between the sublime and the ridiculous." *Blackwood's* said in 1856: "Everybody reads—everybody admires—but nobody believes in Mr. Macaulay."[26]

---

[25] Same, 23 May, 1868, p. 451.

[26] These extracts are taken from reprints in *Littell's Living Age,* Boston, 1849, Vol. 21, p. 519; 1849, Vol. 22, p. 460; 1876, Vol. 129, p. 807; 1856, Vol. 51, p. 258.

In the course of a very full and appreciative paper on Macaulay, Walter Bagehot says:

> The style of Macaulay "is too omniscient. Everything is too plain. All is clear; nothing is doubtful. Instead of probability being, as the great thinker expressed it, 'the very guide of life,' it has become a rare exception—an uncommon phenomenon. You rarely come across anything which is not decided. This is hardly the style for history. The data of historical narratives, especially of modern histories, are a heap of confusion . . . . history is a vestige of vestiges; few facts leave any trace of themselves, and witness of their occurrence; of fewer still is that witness preserved. . . . It is not possible that these data can be very fertile in certainties. . . . Each probability seems to him [Macaulay] a certainty, each piece of evidence conclusive. Macaulay's so-called inaccuracy is a phase of this defect. Macaulay's 'party-spirit' is another consequence of his positiveness. When he inclines to a side, he inclines to it too much."[27]

One may find a great many expressions of the same opinion of Macaulay's History. For instance, Carlyle says it is impartial; Lockhart says it is no history. Henry Greville says Macaulay "floored" the Quakers in the Penn incident. Harriet Martineau says the history is mere romance and calls the Penn story a slander. Woodrow Wilson[28] says Macaulay was "subtly turning narrative into argument; we must deem him earnest; we cannot deem him safe; and willingly or unwillingly we reject the guide who takes it upon himself to determine for us what we shall see." [29]

The historian Freeman is another who resents Macaulay's treatment of character: referring to Laud, he says: "Macaulay's mere contempt is certainly out of place." And he commends Gardiner for that he "certainly does not tell his story like Macaulay."[30]

This line of criticism has not only continued, but is rendered necessary by the charm and virility by which the critics acknowledge themselves captivated.

Summary

For us it is repeated, because there are

---

[27] Bagehot: *Literary Studies*, Ed. of 1856, Vol. 2, pp. 221-260; Ed. of 1898, Vol. 2, pp. 38-42. See also Beeching: *Francis Atterbury*, 1909, Preface.

[28] Now President of Princeton University.

[29] Moulton: *Library of Literary Criticism*, Vol. 6, p. 103.

[30] Stephens: *Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, 1895, Vol. 2, pp. 187 and 226.

still school trustees, school principals, and school teachers, who, swayed by a great name, warmed by a great heart, charmed by a story well told, are prone to accept Macaulay's writings as history.[31] One cannot help feeling that to "expose" Macaulay in an age when he receives so much popular and unwarranted trust, would be a service to the truth.

Solely because of glare and vogue, Macaulay's view of the English Reformation became the view of our ancestors, and has been handed down to us as a tradition. As we go on, we shall see how his view survives at the present day, and in what cases it becomes the personal assumption of modern writers; and finally, we shall see in what quarters an effort is made to contradict it. With such a momentum Macaulay's view of the English Church could not fail to impress the English public, and more particularly to find a fertile soil for propagation in the new world. The usual American view of the English Reformation can probably be traced to this source.

A majority of Americans would consider themselves worsted in an argument in which Macaulay could be cited against them. I recall objecting to Macaulay as a final authority on one occasion when he was cited by an influential young American educator, who holds the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from a German University. "Macaulay," he said, "Why Macaulay is the prince of historians!" There are still a great many people of the same opinion. And this chapter will not have failed of its purpose if it should convince but a few persons who find themselves occasionally thinking of our religious history, that the old popular prince of history is but a blind guide for the modern American.

So much for Macaulay. But the main question reaches beyond him, and his work and his reputation. For the English Reformation it is not too much to say that, after the lapse of many years, during which in some circles, which are

[31] May, 1909, Catalogue Maynard's English Classics, p. 16, gives Macaulay's History, chapter 1, with Critical Opinions. But the book gives a few of the favorable lines from Morley, Gladstone, and Leslie Stephen, and on page 47 a special heading, "Origin of the Church of England." This book is fit to buttress a sectarian controversy, rather than for use in any public institution.

in fact the widest circles of our reading public and their disciples, Macaulay's view has prevailed unquestioned, the matter now demands, at the hands of the teachers, the clergy, and the thinking world, a careful re-examination.

CHAPTER IV.

FROUDE AND HIS CRITICS.

WHAT FROUDE SAYS—CRITICISM BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL—HERBERT PAUL, FROUDE'S BIOGRAPHER—WORDS OF COMMENDATION—ANDREW LANG—PROFESSORS COLLINS AND STUBBS.

Few histories are more widely distributed among the public libraries than Froude's. Froude sets the Reformation in its true place:

> "I believe the Reformation to have been the greatest incident in English history; the root and source of the expansive force which has spread the Anglo-Saxon race over the globe, and imprinted the English genius and character on the constitution of mankind." "The Reformation is the hinge on which all modern history turns."[1]
>
> "The greatest achievement in English history, the 'breaking the bonds of Rome,' and the establishment of spiritual independence was completed without bloodshed under Elizabeth's auspices, and Elizabeth may have the glory of the work."[2]

Froude speaks of "the statutes (time of Henry VIII.) establishing the independence of the Church of England, which form the present basis of its connection with the State." He shows in a letter from the Emperor Charles V. to his Ambassador Chapuys, 28 March, 1536, that the emperor proposed concessions moderating papal taxation and "limiting the Pope's remaining pretensions." He speaks of *"l'-Eglise Anglicane,"* "the

Froude's Method

[1] Froude: *The Divorce of Catherine of Aragon as Told by the Imperial Ambassadors,* N. Y. Ed., 1891, p. 18. And *The Council of Trent,* 1896, p. 1.

[2] Froude: *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth,* N. Y. Ed., 1875, Vol. 12 (or *Reign of Elizabeth,* Vol. 6), p. 587.

Church of England," and of "the Roman Church." This is of interest, as it is said in several text-books which we shall have to notice that these terms arose at a much later period; we shall show that on the contrary they belong to a time even earlier than this. There is also "the Church of England" in 1537.[3]

Froude sets a good precedent, which other historians have forgotten to follow, with consequent detriment to their work, in his recognition of the exact limits in Christendom within which the papacy had been recognized as an influence. There is here an important geographical consideration which must always be reckoned with in making conceptions of historic separations existing amongst Christian peoples, and the re-unions which possibly may follow. Froude thus speaks of "the Western Church" and, at some length, of "the Eastern branch of the divided Church."[4]

East and West

Froude gives correctly the directions for the education of the people in 1536, a matter which has sometimes, through the text-books, been greatly misunderstood, because misstated.

> "The paternoster, the apostles' creed, and the ten commandments had been lately published in English. Fathers of families, schoolmasters, and heads of households were to take care that these fundamental elements of the Christian faith should be learnt by the children and servants under their care; and the law of the land was to be better observed, which directed that every child should be brought up to learning or to some honest occupation" . . . and "a Bible in English [is] to be provided in every parish." Basing her membership on these "fundamental elements," the Church of England put the charge to teach children the creed, Lord's prayer, and ten commandments into the Baptismal service, and in 1661 the same charge was added to the Confirmation service; and in years preceding, these "fundamentals" were publicly recited at Confirmations. The association of the apostles' creed is with early Christian history, the creed being an easily-

Preserving the Old Creed

[3] The same, Vol. 2, Appendix, pp. 507 and 538; Vol. 3, p. 229.

[4] Froude: *Short Studies on Great Subjects,* Second Series, *Calvinism,* N. Y. Ed., 1872, pp. 39 and 40, and Froude: *The Story of the Spanish Armada and Other Essays,* N. Y. Ed., 1892, p. 224.

memorized brief of the Scriptures; the paternoster is the word of Christ; the ten commandments are associated with the name of Moses. Here, evidently, would be small evidence of a "new religion," as some have ventured to describe it, springing up at the Reformation. To the old creed, Lord's prayer, and commandments the Church of England "changed back," by an act of renewal of her vows and remembrance of her principles. "The 'materials' of monastic religion were the real or counterfeit relics of real or counterfeit saints, and images of Christ or the Virgin, and not supposed, but ascertained, to bring in a pleasant and abundant revenue to their happy possessors." [5]

Speaking of the fall of Cromwell in 1540, Froude says: "Wave after wave has rolled over his work. Romanism flowed back over it under Mary. Puritanism, under another even grander Cromwell, overwhelmed it. But Romanism ebbed again, and Puritanism is dead, and the polity of the Church of England remains as it was left by its creator." He speaks of the Reformation prelates as being "the founders of the English Church." The last will and testament of King Henry VIII. was written probably in 1544, executed in 1546, but four weeks before the king's death, and is drawn "in the name of God and of the Glorious Blessed Virgin our Lady St. Mary, and of all the Holy Company of Heaven." It says: "We do instantly require and desire the blessed Virgin Mary His mother . . . to pray for us." It provides for daily Masses "to be said perpetually while the world shall endure." A vast amount of money is left for these Masses.

Henry VIII. no Protestant

Why is not this proper material for source-books? When the religious views of Henry VIII. are under discussion, here is a document of final authority from which the pupil may judge for himself. Henry's religion is more mediaeval than primitive, more late Catholic than Protestant or Scriptural.

Froude's looseness of language when he treats of religion will become evident from this passage: "Fitzalan . . . had served under three sovereigns and under three creeds." He names the sovereigns: Henry, Mary, Elizabeth. It is certain that all professed the same creeds, notwithstanding minor

Question of a Change of Creed

[5] Froude: *History*, Vol. 3, 79, 80, 265, and 478; Vol. 4, pp. 488 and 479.

differences, however grave, and notwithstanding the intense excitement of the times over differences which were actually minor. In this new age, when the religious differences are between Oriental and Western, between Christian and non-Christian or pseudo-Christian, it is a matter of vital importance that the class should understand that no such difference existed at the time of the Reformation; that the Creeds of all parties were the Apostles' and Nicene, and that the development of Christendom to the present time has been largely the development of peoples whose religious education has been with, or on the lines of, these creeds. Certainly to speak now of Protestant, Orthodox, or Roman creeds will not do for that time, since it would be sure to leave a false impression of a separation between the earlier Christian peoples or parties which did not then exist. Nor may we work for the perpetuation or currency of such phrases as "the change of religion,"[6] "the old religion,"[7] "the old belief"[8] "a change of creed,"[9] or "old creeds decayed";[10] or, "the establishment of a Creed," or that "creeds rise and fall," when as a fact the great common creed of Christendom has existed essentially from Christendom's infancy, is in strict accord with the primary documents of Christianity, and has not fallen any more than it has arisen. But Froude says elsewhere: "The creed of eighteen centuries is not about to fade away like an exhalation." Yet "the creed of the early Church was not the creed of the Middle Ages, any more than the creed of Luther and Cranmer was the creed of St. Bernard and Aquinas. Old things pass away, new things come in their place." [10]

How Froude Uses "Creed"

Froude further says:

> "The Anglican hierarchy . . . . drew its life from Elizabeth's throne, and had Elizabeth fallen, it would have crumbled into sand. The Church of England was a limb lopped off from the Catholic trunk; it was cut away from the stream by which its

Denies Catholicity

---

[6] The same: Vol. 7, Ch. 1, 1559, p. 45, top and bottom.
[7] Vol. 10, Ch. xx, p. 117.
[8] *Short Studies*, 1, 195.
[9] Vol. 7, Ch. VI., p. 541, and Vol. 12, p. 570.
[10] *Short Studies*, 2, 466; 1, 15; 1, 178-179.

> vascular system had been fed; and the life of it, as an independent and corporate existence was gone forever. . . . The image, in its outward aspect, could be made to correspond with the parent tree; and to sustain the illusion, it was necessary to provide Bishops who could appear to have inherited their powers by the approved method, as successors of the apostles." "The Bishops . . . were to regard themselves as possessed of no authority independent of the crown. They were not successors of the apostles, but merely ordinary officials." [11]

Froude again:

> "The degenerate ministry which had taken the place of the Catholic priests";[12] and: "My object . . . . was to describe the transition from the Catholic England with which the century opened . . . into the England of progressive intelligence." The battle with the Spanish Armada, 30 July, 1588, "was the sermon which completed the conversion of the English nation, and transformed the Catholics into Anglicans." "The more moderate Catholics transformed themselves into Catholics with a difference—Anglo-Catholics or High Churchmen." While "The Apostolical succession has become the first article of the creed of half the clergy." [13]

Denies Catholicity

Rise of "High Church"

It is possible to find few who would admit the origin of Anglo-Catholicism as stated by Mr. Froude. He flatly and passionately denies them their standing-ground, which is, that Catholic conservation was the first purpose of the English Church in the Reformation. Froude's feelings come out plainly in two expressions, the "Romanist superstition" and "the Book of Common Prayer of the present Church of England."[14] In a heading, Froude uses the phrase "the new and the old creed." And:

> "The priest was converted absolutely into a minister; the altar into a table. . . . But these peculiarities were uncongenial with the rest of the Liturgy, with which they refused to harmonize and . . . were dropped or modified."[15]

And I believe it is Froude who says somewhere:

> "The creed of a thousand years was made a crime by a doctrine of yesterday."

---

[11] Froude: *History,* Vol. 7, Ch. II., p. 179, 1559, also Vol. 5, Ch. XXIV., p. 23, 1547. See also *Short Studies,* 3, Sec. 6, p. 119.
[12] *History,* Vol. 10, Ch. XXI., p. 195.
[13] The same: Vol. 12, pp. 555, 556, 557, 579.
[14] The same: Vol. 6, Ch. XXXV., p. 495; and Vol. 5, Ch. XXV., p. 141.
[15] The same: Vol. 5, Ch. XXVIII., p. 365; Vol. 7, Ch. II., p. 105.

Although Froude says that he does not rejoice in iniquity, the almost joyous manner in which he spreads upon his pages the details of badness makes these volumes more unfit than any other history to occupy a place upon school shelves. Pupils will know what badness is without the aid of descriptions of any sort. A second disqualification is the spirit in which the work is written—the spirit of bitter brilliancy ever memorable to those who, like the writer, have had the ill-fortune to have heard Froude lecturing in his sad and darkened last days. Yet in the last lectures of his life, Froude makes use of expressions quite contradictory to many of the expressions which we have already quoted. For he admits that the present Anglican Bishops are English Catholics as distinguished from Roman Catholics. He is speaking of the Lord Howard, Elizabeth's admiral at the time of the Armada: "Lord Howard of Effingham was no more a Roman Catholic than—I hope I am not taking away their character—than the present Archbishop of Canterbury or the Bishop of London. He was a Catholic, but an English Catholic, *as those reverend prelates are.*" "Lord Howard may have been an Anglo-Catholic; Roman Catholic he never was." "The Church of England was re-established on an Anglo-Catholic basis." "The Catholic peers . . . discovered that in Anglicanism they could *keep the faith of their fathers.*"[16] Here we see a change of view and a softening towards his old enemies. It is remarkable that this fierce scorner of Anglicanism should have so altered his customary mode of expression. But it was said in Oxford that he was going back to the Church.

Froude's Change of View

To write history without color or bias was not in his gift. As James Russell Lowell says, speaking of the different kinds of history written to illuminate the American Civil War:

> "Sometimes a period is selected, where the facts, by coloring and arrangement, may be made to support the views of a party, and history becomes a political pamphlet in-

[16] Froude: *English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century,* N. Y. Ed., 1895, pp. 4, 116, 154, and 228. And see *The Council of Trent,* 1896, pp. 2, 12, 274, 208, and 243.

definitely prolonged. Here point is the one thing needful —to be attained at all hazards, whether by the turn of a sentence or the twisting of a motive. Macaulay is preëminent in this kind, and woe to the party or man that comes between him and his epigrammatic necessity! Again, there is the new light, or perhaps, more properly, the forlorn-hope method, where the author accepts a brief against the *advocatus diaboli,* and strives to win a reverse of judgment, as Mr. Froude has done in the case of Henry VIII." [17]

Lowell on Froude

"Impartial he never was, nor pretended to be." "He was sometimes carried away by his own eloquence, and his convictions grew stronger as he expressed them, until the facts on the other side looked so small that they were ignored." [18]

" 'Excepting Froude,' wrote Lord Acton in a letter to Mary Gladstone, 'I consider Carlyle the most detestable of historians.' " Thus opens a review friendly to Froude.[19] It is useful here because it brings up about all the good things that have been said for Froude, including a carefully expurgated extract from Herbert Paul's biography, correctly quoted above, and some favorable words from Andrew Lang, whose fuller and truer estimate however I will give later. The praise from Lang is this: " 'Mr. Froude was behind the scenes of Queen Elizabeth's reign as no historian had ever been,' and 'he had a remarkable gift for seeing vividly at a glance, and of describing broadly a wide and complicated situation in European politics.' "[20] The other passages quoted are these: Stubbs: "A great work," "A work of great industry, power and importance." "Gardiner recommended it." "Skelton, . . . a Scottish historian, says: 'Only the man or woman who had had to work upon the mass of Scottish material in the Record Office can properly appreciate Mr. Froude's inexhaustible industry and substantial accuracy.' " "Professor Pollard . . . declares that 'there is inadequate justification for the systematic detraction of Froude's

Froude Defended

---

[17] James Russell Lowell: *Political Essays,* Ed. of 1897, "The Rebellion," pp. 123 and 124.

[18] Herbert Paul: *Life of J. A. Froude,* 1905, pp. 415, 417, and 420.

[19] In *The Twentieth Century Quarterly* (London: Simkins), 17 April, 1906, p. 116, by A. W. Evans. Cf. Paul: *Lord Acton's Letters,* 1904, p. 170.

[20] Same, referring to *Cornhill,* No. 116, New Series, p. 252.

History which has become the fashion. He held strong views, and made some mistakes, but his mistakes were no greater than those of other historians, and there are not half a dozen histories in the English language which have been based on so exhaustive a survey of original materials.' And elsewhere he describes it as 'the only history which has made adequate use of the foreign correspondence of the reign of Edward VI.' "[21] We can admire the industry which worked through 900 volumes of letters, etc., in five languages, without making it finally necessary to reject the truth of the criticisms by which this historian is so universally discredited.

Andrew Lang said:

> "The Victorian age has its Macaulay, Carlyle, and Froude, all men of imagination, who exercised that faculty freely on the real events of the past. For those who have a peevish desire to know what the real events were, the age can produce Mr. Gardiner. The other great writers give us drama of the most moving and delightful sort, based on actual records and highly colored according to the taste and fancy of the author. In this kind of imaginative history, the Victorian age is probably superior to any other. The scientific spirit reached the writers mentioned just enough and not too much. All of them worked industriously at manuscript sources. It may be that Macaulay and Mr. Froude, especially, are not on 'our side'; our heroes may not be theirs, and we may adore what they burned. In both we recognize prejudices amounting to judicial blindness sometimes, and in Mr. Froude we regret a congenital incapacity for accuracy." [22]

On Froude and Others

It has been said somewhere of Froude that he copied out his authorities with meticulous care, but had a defect of vision which prevented his seeing the word *not*.[23] Professor Collins gave us another laconic view of Froude when he said that by the French, "chronic inaccuracy" is called "Froude's-disease."

Somehow, in spite of all his labor and passionate earnestness, Froude seems to have called out the humor of criticism as no historian ever did. The cup of the amenities is filled

[21] Pollard: *Thomas Cranmer*, p. viii.
[22] Lang: *Victorian Literature*, 1897.
[23] *Church Times*, 19 March, 1909.

up in a bit of correspondence between the historians Green and Stubbs. The latter wrote:

"I have made a hymn on Froude and Kingsley, thus—

> " 'Froude informs the Scottish youth
> That parsons do not care for truth.
> The Reverend Canon Kingsley cries,
> History is a pack of lies.
> What cause for judgments so malign?
> A brief reflection solves the mystery—
> Froude believes Kingsley a divine,
> And Kingsley goes to Froude for History." [24]

[24] Hutton: *Letters of William Stubbs,* p. 162.

CHAPTER V.

HALLAM, SOUTHEY, AND OTHERS.

HALLAM'S VIEWS—VALUE ESTIMATED BY MACAULAY—BY PROFESSOR GEORGE P. FISHER—BY MR. HUTTON—BY LORD ACTON—DEFICIENCIES OF THE PERIOD—STEPHENS ON THE PERIOD AND ON HALLAM—STUBBS—SOUTHEY ON THE REFORMATION—DICKENS—KNIGHT.

We will now go back to a historian who died in 1859; his great work was written in 1827.

Hallam uses the title found in the coronation oath, conspicuous by its absence from the regular Prayer Book of the Church, namely "the Protestant Church of England."[1] He says further:

> "By these means was the Church of England altogether emancipated from the superiority of that of Rome." "It was obviously among the first steps required in order to introduce a mode of religion at once more reasonable and more earnest than the former, that the public services of the Church should be expressed in the mother tongue of the congregation. The Latin ritual had been unchanged since the age when it was vernacular, partly through the sluggish dislike of innovation, but partly also because the mysteriousness of an unknown dialect served to impose on the vulgar . . . yet what was thus concealed would have borne the light. Our own liturgy, so justly celebrated for its piety, elevation, and simplicity, is in a great measure a translation from the Catholic services, or more properly from those which had been handed down from a more primitive age, those portions, of course, being omitted which had relation to different principles of worship." "Those who have visited some Catholic

Hallam's Statement

[1] Hallam: *Constitutional History of England,* Chap. 2. Even its single appearance in the cor. oath was forced against the expressed will of the Church. See Macleane: *Our Island Church,* 1909, pp. 102 and 103.

temples and attended to the current language of devotion must have perceived what the writings of apologists or decrees of councils will never enable them to discover, that the Saints, but more especially the Virgin, are almost exclusively the *popular* deities of that religion. All this polytheism was swept away by the reformers; *and in this may be deemed to consist the most specific difference of the two systems.*" "Before the end of 1559 the English Church, so long contended for as a prize by the two religions, was lost forever to that of Rome." While Hallam often uses terms like Roman, Romish, Papist, he also calls the same party Catholics; and refers to "the act imposing such heavy penalties on Catholic priests for refusing the oath of supremacy." "Priests travelled the country in various disguises." We find Hallam referring to "the moderate reformers who established the new Anglican Church."

Some of these expressions appear conservative, some quite radical. This book will be seen to belong to a period in which few English historians were able to write without injured perspective. Yet Hallam is cordially attested. In Macaulay we find this:

Macaulay on Hallam

"On a general survey, we do not scruple to pronounce the Constitutional History the most impartial book that we ever read. We think it the more incumbent on us to bear this testimony strongly at first setting out, because in the course of our remarks we shall think it right to dwell principally on those parts of it from which we dissent."[2]

This is sufficient to indicate the plan of an essay to which those are referred who would pursue the subject. The late Prof. George P. Fisher of Yale says of Hallam: "It is thorough and impartial in its treatment of religious parties and persons."[3] On the other hand, Mr. Hutton says Hallam is the "strangest of all pretenders to impartiality," while the

On Hallam

inaugural address of Stubbs as Professor of History at Oxford declared that the speaker would not build history on the foundations of Hallam, Froude, or Macaulay, "but on the abundant, collected, and arranged materials on which these writers tried to build while they were scanty, and scattered, and in disorder."[4]

---

[2] Macaulay: *Essays.*
[3] Fisher: *The Reformation,* Ed. of 1906, p. 495.
[4] Hutton: *Letters of William Stubbs,* pp. 58 and 119.

Lord Acton said: "The old story which satisfied Hallam will never be told again." [5]

Dean Stephens says:

> "It was not merely in their neglect of the early history of their country that our writers in this century were deficient. They were so steeped in the political and religious prejudices of their time, and so entirely convinced of the superiority of their own age to all preceding ages, that they were incapable of forming true conceptions and fair judgments of the characters and actions of men in remote times. They looked down upon them with a kind of cynical disdain. More especially did they fail to do justice to the influence of the Church, to point out how much it has done for learning and the arts of civilization in rude and barbarous times, and how much help it had given to the people in some of their struggles with tyrannical sovereigns for civil and political rights. They could not give ecclesiastics credit for any purity of motive, and were perpetually sneering at the hypocrisy, superstition, and priestcraft which they imputed to them. . . . . Even Hallam is not free from these faults, vastly superior as he is to Hume in range of knowledge and research, in breadth of sympathy and fairness of judgment. And, of course, smaller histories written for the young followed the lead of the larger ones." [6]

We are simply reckoning with the facts of the influence of mind upon mind when we record that this view has been chosen to persist to the present day amongst persons who have not had a care to be well-informed as well as cautious and considerate. It is so easy to hand on what we have received. And in this case unquestionably the received opinion of seventy-five years ago accords quite satisfactorily with the wishes and ideas of people who have always held themselves apart from the church of which they speak. So we have it that some of the latest American publications, with all their up-to-date results in book-making and illustrating, and above all with the increased facilities for gathering facts, propagated the doctrine of Hallam and Macaulay. How history now deals with Hallam may be pointed out in the weighty and as always kindly criticism of Stubbs:

[5] Acton: *Historical Essays and Studies*, p. 1.
[6] Stephens: *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman*, 1895, Vol. 1, pp. 111 and 112.

"For my own part I do not see why an honest partisan should not write an honest book if he can persuade himself to look honestly at his subject, and make allowance for his own prejudices. I know it is somewhat critical work, and a man who knows himself in one way, may be quite ignorant of himself in another. I take Hallam as an illustrious example; Hallam knew himself to be a political partisan, and, wherever he knew that political prejudice might darken his counsel, he guarded most carefully against it: he did not claim the judicial character without fitting himself for it; and where he knew himself to be sitting as judge he judged admirably; so admirably that the advanced advocates even of his own views have long ago thrown him over as too timid and temporizing for their purpose. Yet where he was not awake to his own prejudice in matters, for instance, regarding religion and the Church, in which he seems to have no doubt about his own infallibility of negation, how ludicrously and transparently unfair he is!" [7]

Stubbs

Hallam lived in the worst possible period for writing English History. A Churchman like Southey can say: "The founders of the English Church were not hasty reformers," and "the English Church and the Queen, its re-founder, are clear of persecution as regards the Catholics." [8] This was written in 1825. It was not a good time for history and it was not a good time for religion. Mr. Gladstone quotes with approval Carlyle's saying that at this time religion in the Church of England was in danger of becoming a sham. Except, of course, "a faithful few," "the Church of England at large had seemed to be rapidly approximating, in practice, to the character of what a powerful writer denominates, in homely phrase, 'a sham.' This, we say with pain and shame, was what the Church of England appeared to be about to become." [9]

Southey

"With regard to the Church of England, its foundations rest upon the rock of scripture, not upon the character of the King by whom they were laid." Southey calls the Roman Catholics first Catholics, then Romanists, then Papists, and speaks of the Roman Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Romish Church. He says "The Norman Conquest

[7] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures*, p. 125.
[8] Southey: *Book of the Church.*
[9] *Gleanings of Past Years*, Vol. 5, pp. 8 and 9.

produced more good than evil by bringing our Church into a closer connection with Rome." He speaks of "the establishment of the Church under Elizabeth." Twice he speaks of the "fathers of the English Church," meaning Reformers. He speaks of "The Church of England since its separation from Rome." [10] Southey does not seem to have known just where to stand on this question; his words point both ways.

Southey

If anything had been needed to ensure the establishment of Macaulay's and Hallam's view of the English Church, we should get it from the former popularity in this country of Charles Dickens and his works. In *A Child's History of England,* we have a book of this character which had its influence. Once widely circulated, and lately, sold at very cheap prices and in wretched type, it is I suppose, practically unused to-day. It speaks of a new Church at the Reformation. Of Henry VIII. it gives the extreme opposite view to Froude's. Henry was "one of the most detestable villains that ever drew breath," "a blot of blood and grease upon the history of England."[11]

Dickens

Knight's *Popular History of England* (1856) is a book which he says he was induced to write by reason of a newspaper statement[12] that "we have no other History of England than Hume's." It was because of "Hume's manifold defects." Knight at the outset takes Hume's stand in speaking of the Anglican Church before the Reformation. The history devotes one and one-third volumes to the pre-Reformation period, and over six volumes to the ensuing 325 years. This work is indexed on the principle that the Church of England, before and after the Reformation, is one and the same Church. Knight's book shows a wide knowledge of circumstance and interesting facts. It is not a weighty authority, but it has enjoyed a large circulation.

Knight

---

[10] Southey: *Book of the Church;* one volume before the Reformation, and one volume after. Vol. 2, pp. 101, 264, 265, 267, 268; and *Life of Wesley,* 1820, Chap. IX., pp. 186, 199, 204, and 206.

[11] Dickens: *Child's History,* Chap. XXVII., pp. 256, 280, of The Fireside Dickens; see also pp. 287, 291, 296, 305.

[12] In *The Times,* 1854. Knight: *The Popular History of England,* Introd. pp. i and ii.

CHAPTER VI.

FREEMAN AND HIS PUPILS.

FREEMAN'S VIEW—MR. MURPHY ON FREEMAN—STEPHENS, HIS BIOGRAPHER—THE HISTORIAN THIRLWALL—AMBASSADOR BRYCE—STEPHENS—DR. DÖLLINGER—STUBBS—PROFESSOR ADAMS OF YALE—FREEMAN'S IDEA OF HIS WORK—MISS YONGE'S VIEW—MRS. ROMANES ON MISS YONGE—PROFESSOR FREEMAN'S CONFIDENCE IN MISS YONGE—AND IN MISS THOMPSON—HER STATEMENTS.

Professor Freeman says:

"There were great differences in the way in which the Reformation arose and was carried out in different countries. . . . . In some countries quite new forms of worship were set up, while in others men cast off the authority of the Pope and changed what they thought wrong in doctrine and practice, but let the general order of the Church go on much as it did before." The extremes each way may be seen in one island of Great Britain; for "of all the countries which made any reformation at all, England changed the least and Scotland the most." After speaking of the names Protestant, Reformed, Catholics, Papists, and Romanists, Freeman adds: "Perhaps it is safest to use the name Roman Catholics, a name which is not very consistent with itself, but which avoids disputes either way, and which in England is the name known to the law." "Under Elizabeth . . . . the English Reformation finally settled. The Pope's authority was again thrown off, such changes as were thought needful were made in doctrine and worship, but the general system and government of the Church went on." [1]

Freeman's View

Freeman

"Our own Church . . . . found it needful to throw off the obedience to the Pope altogether," and "the English Church was for a long time (before the Reformation) one of the most flourishing Churches in Christendom." [2]

---

[1] Freeman: *A General Sketch of History*, Ed. of 1872, in Freeman's Historical Course for Schools, Chap. 13, pp. 240, 241, 262.

[2] Freeman: *Old English History*, Ed. of 1869, pp. 43 and 62.

On the general principle of Catholic Churches, Professor Freeman wrote in 1856: "The Greek and English Churches both represent . . . . the principle of independent national Churches, as opposed to the foreign supremacy of the Latins." "The Pope is just the shadow of the Emperor, and now that there is no Emperor, there need not be any Pope." "For three hundred years (before 1509) the Pope had been the standing grievance of Englishmen." And of Henry: "Nobody has really got to the bottom of Henry VIII. . . . His religion . . . I take not to have been very different from Lanfranc's, or from Anselm's before the Papishes caught him. . . . . I only wish he had carried it out better in practice." Freeman wrote in 1858: "It is supposed by some that the Church was sometime or other endowed by the State . . . but that . . . is simply a mistake. The thing never happened . . . . except some comparatively small and comparatively recent pecuniary grants, the Church of England owes all her pecuniary revenues to the voluntary system. . . . . It is said that in the sixteenth century Church property changed hands, that it was taken from one church and given to another. In the mouth of a Roman Catholic this may mean that Roman Catholics ought to possess it; in the mouth of a Protestant it is [an argument] to illustrate the power of the State. But here again, the event never happened. . . . Legally and historically the Church before the Reformation and the Church after the Reformation are one and the same body. The Church presided over by Augustine [597], by Becket [1162-70], by Cranmer [1533-56], by Laud [1633-45], and by Sumner [1848-62], is one and the same society. There was no transfer from one society to another, but an existing society made certain changes in its own constitution. . . . . There have always been changes in the Church from Augustine onwards; the sixteenth century simply witnessed more extensive and more rapid changes than any other."[3]

"These," says his biographer, "are . . . opinions from which he never afterwards deviated." And Stephens speaks of Freeman's "proving the historical continuity of the Church of England from the Mission of St. Augustine to the present day, and demolishing the vulgar fallacies that it was established in the sixteenth century, or indeed at any

[3] Stephens: *The Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman,* 1895. Vol. I, p. 231; Vol. II, pp. 222 and 401, and Vol. I, pp. 213, 214, and 211.

definite time, or that its property was national property, or that this property was ever transferred from one religious body to another."[4]

Professor Freeman's most extended utterance upon this subject came at the time of his maturity and greatest recognition. He set himself, at the time of a disestablishment agitation, to restrain the defenders of the National Church from their cry of "sacrilege," and at the same time to explain in what manner the property of the Church might become "national property." His words follow:

> "There was no one particular moment when, as many people fancy, the State endowed the Church by a deliberate act, still less was there any moment when the State, as many people fancy, took the Church property from one religious body and gave it to another. The whole argument must assume, because the facts of history compel us to assume, the absolute identity of the Church of England after the Reformation with the Church of England before the Reformation . . . . as a matter of law and history, as a matter of plain fact, there was no taking from one religious body and giving to another. . . . . No act was done by which legal and historical continuity was broken. Any lawyer must know that, though Pole succeeded Cranmer and Parker succeeded Pole, yet nothing was done to break the uninterrupted succession of the Archbishopric of Canterbury as a corporation sole in the eye of the law, . . . the general taking from one religious body and giving to another, which many people fancy took place under Henry VIII. or Elizabeth, simply never happened at all. . . . . There was no one particular moment, called the Reformation, at which the State of England determined to take property from one Church or set of people and to give it to another."[5]
>
> "The popular notion clearly is that the Church was 'established' at the Reformation. People seem to think that Henry VIII. or Edward VI. or Elizabeth, having perhaps

[4] Stephens: *Freeman.*

[5] Freeman: *Disestablishment and Disendowment. What are They?* By Edward A. Freeman, Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. 2d edition, 1885; pp. 13-15. The student will find himself handicapped in his efforts to obtain this essay, as it is not contained in the second and other editions of Freeman's *Historical Essays,* in three volumes. As it is the most full and direct treatment of a subject now come to the front again in connection with the Welsh Church, it is imperative that every public library offering guidance in History and Politics should possess a copy or more; a condition which will be found in rare cases. It is, in fact, quite difficult to obtain this important book. Macmillan has a reprint of date 1907, not kept in stock in this country.

already 'disestablished' an older Church, went on next of set purpose to 'establish' a new one. They chose, it seems to be commonly thought, that form of religion which they thought best; they established it, endowed it, clothed it with certain privileges, and, by way of balance, subjected it to a strict control on the part of the State. When they might have established the Roman Catholic Church, or the Lutheran Church of Germany, or the Calvinist Church of Geneva, they devised, as became the sovereigns of an island realm, something different from the Churches of all other countries, and called into being the Church of England. . . . . But, as a matter of history and as a matter of law, nothing of the kind ever happened. As a matter of law and history, however it may be as a matter of theology, the Church of England after the Reformation is the same body as the Church of England before the Reformation. . . . .

"Looking in this way at the events of the sixteenth century, it is certain no English ruler, no English Parliament, thought of setting up a new Church, but simply of reforming the existing English Church. Nothing was further from the mind of Henry the Eighth or of Elizabeth than the thought that either of them was doing anything new. Neither of them ever thought for a moment of establishing a new Church or of establishing anything at all. In their own eyes they were not establishing, but reforming; they were not pulling down or setting up, but putting to right. They were getting rid of innovations and corruptions; they were casting off an usurped foreign jurisdiction, and restoring to the Crown its ancient authority over the State ecclesiastical. . . . . There was no one act called 'the Reformation'; the Reformation was a gradual result of a long series of acts. There was no one moment, no Act of Parliament, when and by which a Church was 'established'; still less was there any act by which one Church was 'disestablished' and another Church 'established' in its place. . . . . In all that they did Henry and Elizabeth had no more thought of establishing a new Church than they had of founding a new nation." [6]

Edgar G. Murphy, known to American educators as the Executive Secretary of the Southern Education Board and Vice-President of the Conference for education in the South, has expressed the highest opinion of Freeman as a historian. Mr. Murphy says:

[6] Same, pp. 26-29.

Freeman's Standing

"When the editors of the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* looked over the scholars of the period for the first authority on English History, they found that authority in the person of Edward A. Freeman, Professor of History in the University of Oxford. It was, accordingly, Professor Freeman, assisted by Professor Gardiner, who wrote for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* the article on the History of England. In a recent issue of *Scribner's Magazine,* Professor Freeman was called the greatest of English historians."[7]

Of Freeman and J. R. Green, Stephens says:

> "Freeman was unquestionably superior in range and variety of learning, and more exact and cautious in statement, . . . but he readily admitted that he was surpassed by his friend in brilliancy of style and power of vivid description. If Freeman had intellectual powers of the highest order, Green was endowed with some of the indescribable gifts of genius. He had also some of the caprices, the occasional carelessness and eccentricities which so often accompany genius, and there were times when these peculiarities manifested themselves in ways which were provoking to a man of Freeman's regular and methodical habits. But Freeman loved and admired him too warmly ever to be long or seriously vexed with him. He was accustomed to say that 'Johnny' . . . was a wonderful creature, alike in himself and in his works, that he was not as other men, and was not to be judged by the same standards as other men, and that on the whole he couldn't wish him to be other than what he was."

The historian Thirlwall thus commends Freeman for a History Professorship:

"I have much pleasure in stating that I not only consider him eminently fitted for the office, but that I should not be able to name any living scholar who appears to me more highly qualified for it."

In June 1870, James Bryce said of Freeman:

> *"Virum praesento . . . . semper studiosissimum, in originibus Anglicis mire doctum, in negligentiorum hominum erroribus detegendis acerrimum."*

---

[7] Murphy: *Words for the Church,* 1897, pp. 23 and 24. It is impossible to find better summaries than Murphy's: on pp. 17, 20, 22, and 85.

"With a profound and minute knowledge," says Mr. Bryce, "of English history down to the fourteenth century—so far as his strange aversion to the employment of manuscript authorities would allow—and a scarcely inferior knowledge of foreign European history during the same period; with a less full but very sound knowledge down to the middle of the sixteenth century . . . he hardly ever made a mistake." [8]

Ambassador Bryce

Stephens says:

"His merits as a historian depended upon certain moral qualities almost as much as upon his intellectual gifts. Devotion to truth, which counts no pains too great to ascertain it, courage in speaking it at all hazards, a deep sense of duty, and that power of appreciating whatever is truly noble in human character and action, which comes from keeping a high moral standard in view—these qualities, which were most conspicuous in him, are indeed essential elements in the character of a really great historian." "Of the historian, as of the military general, it may be truly said that the greatest is he who makes the fewest mistakes. All make some; but a careful distinction must be drawn between writers who are habitually accurate and others who, either from some mental defect or from carelessness, are habitually inaccurate. Blunders or questionable statements may be discovered in Gibbon, in Hallam, in Thirlwall, in Arnold, and, occasionally, even in Bishop Stubbs, yet no one would hesitate to pronounce all these historians to be eminently trustworthy, and some of them exceptionally accurate. They stand in a totally different class from writers whose statements must always be received with caution and doubt until their truth has been tested. And certainly a much larger number of errors than have yet been detected in Freeman's writings would not disqualify him from taking a high rank in the class of accurate historians. Alike from habit of mind and from conscientious care, he was essentially an exact man. His correspondence abundantly proves what infinite pains he took to ascertain facts, and to correct his own mistakes in later editions of his writings; and how grateful he was to his friends for pointing out any errors which had escaped his notice." Froude "in an article of forty pages, made slips almost as numerous as those which he has detected in a whole volume of Freeman's History."

---

[8] Stephens: *Freeman*, Vol. I; pp. 306 and 308; and Vol. II, pp. 1 and 2. Condensed, and pp. 467 and 468. See page 54: "Freeman would top the list."

"Döllinger," says Acton, "assured the Bavarian Academy that Mr. Freeman . . . . is the author of the most profound work on the Middle Ages ever written in this country, and is not only a brilliant writer and sagacious critic, but the most learned of all our countrymen."[9]

Stubbs said:

> "Mr. Freeman's *Norman Conquest,* which, I believe, is well known to us all, is a monument of critical erudition and genius in the re-creation of historical life. . . . We have seen the conclusion . . . of Mr. Froude's great work, a book to which even those who differ in principle from the writer will not refuse the tribute of praise as a work of great industry, power, and importance; the conclusion of the great work of one of the best and greatest men that Oxford has ever produced, the *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury,* by Dr. Hook . . . To the facile pen of an Oxford man we owe the production of the most popular manual of history that has ever appeared, the *Short History of the English People.*"[10]

The praise accorded to Freeman must have its discount. Professor George B. Adams of Yale says: Freeman "is not to be regarded as a final authority" . . . it is "impossible to accept his conclusions with confidence until they are supported by other investigators."[11] Freeman himself says: "I did not go in for any party, because I went in for facts, and all parties, as parties, go against facts. Is not that true? If I told my story of the sixteenth century to a mixed mob of Romans, Anglicans, and Puritans, how they would with one accord stone me."[12]

Edith Thompson, a pupil of Professor Freeman's, wrote:

> "Those who adhered to the Pope were called *Roman Catholics, Romanists, and Papists,* and, by themselves, simply *Catholics,* because they claimed that they alone kept the

[9] Stephens: *Freeman,* Vol. II, pp. 462, 465, 466, 472. The last of these is from Acton in the *English Historical Review,* October, 1890. This is the judgment of two Roman Catholics.

[10] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures,* p. 64. Grant: *English Historians,* 1906, has good pages on Macaulay, Froude, Freeman, Lingard, Gardiner, and others. His criticisms are penetrating, he gives a fine sketch of the progress and methods of English History. The book is invaluable for libraries and schools, for use with Beard's *Introduction,* to which, in some features, it is neither a parallel nor an equal: in some it is superior. Prof. Grant does not always take the majority side. Pp. xxiii-lxvii, 192 and 236 are of great value to those studying the Historians.

[11] Adams: *Civilization During the Middle Ages,* 1894, p. 339, note.

[12] Stephens: *Freeman,* Vol. II, p. 87.

Catholic faith." "The Prayer Book of the Church of England was compiled . . . . by Archbishop Cranmer, who took the old Latin services for his ground work." On the question sometimes raised as "doctrinal," or a "change of Creed," Miss Thompson is explicit: "The particular creed of *Martin Luther,* the German leader in this movement, did not take root in England; but the Swiss and French Reformers, who went further than he did, had much influence in the next reign. There was various teaching among the Reformers, but it in general differed from that of Rome on the nature and number of the sacraments and on the obligations and duties of the clergy; the reverence paid to relics and images, and the use of Latin in the Church services, were disapproved of; and the study of the Scriptures was urged on every one." [13]

Under date of 955-959, Miss Thompson had said:

"The *secular* clergy were not monks, but lived in the world, being parsons of parishes and canons of cathedral and collegiate churches, and were often married, despite the feeling which had gradually grown up in the Western Church that the clergy ought not to marry. There is said to have been much ignorance and vice among the seculars. The objects that those who desired a religious reform set before themselves were to restore the monasteries, to introduce a stricter rule of monastic life, and, as far as possible, to get the cathedral and other great churches into the hands of monks, whom they liked better than secular clergymen, married or unmarried." [14]

The Roman Catholic authorities in Canada tried to have Miss Thompson alter this passage. Professor Freeman advised her to "leave the passage as it stands." He says the item is correct, and ought not to be changed to meet a mere demand. "The English clergy certainly did marry very freely." [15]

Charlotte M. Yonge, writing on the Reformation, calls it the "Remodelling of the English Church," and says: "The inner life, which proves ours to be indeed a part of the visible Church, had been preserved through all the vicissitudes of the past reigns, and the Church of England continued her

[13] Thompson: *History of England* in *Freeman's Historical Course for Schools,* adapted for American students, 1885, pp. 163, 174, 162 and 163. The writers in *Freeman's Historical Course* were persons selected for the task by Professor Freeman himself, and he superintended the whole work. Stephens: *Freeman,* Vol. II, pp. 31 and 32.

[14] Same, p. 28.

[15] Stephens: *Life of Freeman,* Vol. II, pp. 188 and 189.

existence as a branch of the Church Catholic, showing her unbroken connection with the foundation of the Apostles."[16] The first introduction to *Cameos,* written 1851, speaks of "our own beloved Catholic Church of England." For nearly fifty years Miss Yonge in various popular books of good historical and literary value taught "the Church of England, and its historic continuity with the Church of Augustine and Anselm."[17] Miss Yonge thus traces the course of events in England:

> "The Pope had been the only person to decide such questions all over the Western Church for many centuries"; "so much had gone amiss in the Church, and they wanted to set it to rights; . . . . there was a great desire that the Church services—many of which had also been in Latin—should be put into English."
>
> "Somerset and Archbishop Cranmer wanted to make more changes in the Church of England . . . . They had all the Prayer Book Services translated into English, leaving out such as they did not approve; the Lessons were read from the English Bible, and people were greatly delighted at being able to worship and to listen to God's Word in their own tongue."
>
> "Mary began to have the Latin services used again—she wanted to be under the Pope again . . . . she succeeded in having the English Church . . . . received again into communion with Rome." "Elizabeth wanted to keep the English Church a pure and true branch of the Church, free of mistakes that had crept in before her father's time. So she restored the English Prayer Book, and cancelled all that Mary had done."
>
> "Such of the English as believed the Pope to have the first right over the Church, were called Roman Catholics, while Elizabeth and her friends were the real Catholics, for they held with the Church Universal of old; and it was the Pope who had broken off with them."[18]

[16] C. M. Yonge: *Cameos from English History: the Reformation.* Ed. of 1879, pp. 286 and 297.

[17] Ethel Romanes: *Charlotte Mary Yonge,* 1908, pp. 45, 46 and 47, and 200.

[18] C. M. Yonge: *Young Folks' History of England,* chpts. 26, 27, 28, pp. 211, 217, 222 and 223, 230, 234, 239, 240. Miss Yonge had some recognition as a careful and good historian, as Professor Freeman chose her to write one of the books in his historical course. Stephens: *Freeman,* Vol. II, p. 138.

CHAPTER VII.

GREEN.

His Equipment—Value of his Judgment as Estimated by Ambassador Bryce—The Review—Green on the English Reformation—And on the Church of England Before the Reformation—Freeman on Green—Stubbs.

A remarkable notice of John Richard Green's life and works was published in the *Edinburgh Review* early in 1902. The writer of the article is evidently master of his subject from every side. John Richard Green was in Holy Orders with a responsible East London parish, a work for which he had neither the physical health nor the religious convictions. His true field was history exclusively, and though he made a noble effort to discipline himself to parochial duty—a discipline of heart and mind which was of immense value to him—he found himself drifting away from conscientious and sincere sympathy with the message of the Church. He set before himself one test: if ever he could not say in its obvious and literal meaning the petition in the Litany "Christ have mercy upon us," with perfect sincerity, he would make no further attempt to exercise his priesthood or hold his office. In time, following the test and his own feelings, he abandoned active priesthood and became a historian. This incident simply shows that the author with whom we are about to deal was first of all a man with no evasions, and that he can be trusted in the pursuit of truth without regard to the cost. Let us take from this review a few helpful remarks serving to give us the measure of the power of some of these names which we are now using.

His Career

"Much was said at the time of the publication (of Green's *Short History of the English People*) about 'in-

Bryce on Green, Macaulay, Froude, and Freeman

accuracy.' According to Mr. Bryce, Green ranks for accuracy as equal to Macaulay. . . . Froude, we suppose, is nowhere, and Freeman, we guess, would top the list. . . . Bishop Stubbs' verdict on the work as a whole is this: 'Like other people, he made mistakes sometimes; but scarcely ever does the correction of his mistakes affect either

Stubbs on Freeman

the essence of the picture or the force of the argument'; and in such matters Stubbs speaks *ex-cathedra.*" Green did not always preserve a judicial temper; he was, as Mr. Bryce confesses, "stronger in perception than in judgment; but he was right in the main, and later writers have not upset him."[1]

Of course the review goes into the discussion of specific instances; it should be read by historians. It goes on to say:

"No single history can be final authority. 'Regular' histories, like those of Bright and Gardiner, must be read by the side of Green." "Freeman is a safer guide for facts, and Stubbs for theories."

"If the boys and girls of to-day grow up believing that

Value of Green's History

the Reformation was not produced by Henry VIII.'s matrimonial failures, but was a part of a European movement, no small part of this is the direct result of the popularity of Green's *Short History.*" The review says of Goldwin Smith:

On Goldwin Smith

"Though he still lives to charm us by the beauty of his style and to instruct us by his insight and knowledge, [he] was at that time too eager a partisan to be a trustworthy historian; and Froude, who

On Froude

surpassed them all in intellectual brilliancy, was a historical heretic, and painted men . . . . rather as they ought to be than as they were. . . . . Of the three [Stubbs, Freeman, and Green]

On Stubbs

Stubbs was much the strongest man. . . . His astonishing accuracy was the result of a vast memory and infinite perseverance in verifying facts."

He then compares Stubbs with Gibbon, to the entire disadvantage of the latter.[2] Green says: Henry

"suddenly consented to the change, suggested by Cranmer,

---

[1] For another criticism of Green, see forward, p. 57.

[2] *Littell's Living Age,* Boston, July 5, 1902, pp. 10, 11, 12.

Green on the English Reformation

> of the mass into a communion service. . . . Cranmer . . . had drifted into a purely Protestant position, and his open break with the older system followed quickly. . . . The new communion which had taken the place of the mass was ordered to be administered in both kinds, and in the English tongue." It seems to me that Green suppresses a great deal of significant truth when he ventures to say "a new catechism embodied the doctrines of Cranmer and his friends."
>
> Under 1552. "The . . . Articles of Religion, which were now introduced, have remained to this day the formal standard of doctrine in the English Church." "The real value of the religious revolution of the sixteenth century lay not in its substitution of one creed for another." In the Reign of Mary:
>
> "The married priests were driven from their churches; the new Prayer-book was set aside; the mass was restored."

Green calls the Papal party the Catholics, and uses "the old faith" for the Roman Catholic; and marks "the gradual dying-out of the Catholic priesthood, and the growth of a new Protestant clergy who supplied their place." Yet "scholars like Hooker, gentlemen like George Herbert, could now be found in the ranks of the priesthood."[3] Hooker was ordained twenty-three years after Elizabeth's accession, and Herbert was not made priest until 1630, half a century after Hooker.[4] Their title to a priesthood, yet not Catholic, is admitted by Green. But it must be said that Green is so conspicuously indifferent to the meanings of exact terms used in religion that his admissions and denials are not of great importance. Teachers should not be led into following his example. A writer who would be ashamed to be caught misnaming the parts of a ship will freely write history without attention to the terms used in religion, even when religion is a primary factor in the history. No claim that exact terms in religion are tedious or uncongenial to the literary mind will serve as an excuse; nor will it do to say that the reader in the average will not know the difference. If history is

---

[3] Green: *Short History of the English People*, Ed. of 1882, Chapter VII, pp. 364, 365, 366, 368, 408, 409. Leslie Stephen: *Letters of John Richard Green*, 1901, pp. 360-362.

[4] Palmer: *The Life and Works of George Herbert*, Boston, 1905, pp. 9 and 39.

ever to be a science admissible in a curriculum of actual knowledge and seeking classification in any tolerable degree with sciences that are exact, this mode of treatment must be eliminated, and for it we must have substituted a manner that is above ignorance or indifference, not to say also above sarcasm.

Of the time of Henry VIII. we have the following words:

> "The series of measures which in their rapid succession changed the whole character of the English Church."

Green gives the strongest recognition to the effects of Roman influence in and upon the Church of England. After the council of Whitby (A. D. 664) he says:

> "The English Church was now a single religious body within the obedience of Rome." [5]

And of the return movement to pure Catholicity nearly a thousand years later:

> "Sturdily as she (Elizabeth) might aver to her subjects that no change had really been made in English religion, that the old faith had only been purified, that the realm had only been freed from Papal usurpation, jealously as she might preserve the old Episcopate, the old service, the old vestments and usages of public worship, her action abroad told too plainly its tale."

And:

> "The world was drifting to a conflict between the old tradition of the past and a faith that rejected the tradition of the past, and in this conflict men saw that England was ranging itself not on the side of the old belief but of the new." [6]

These are radical utterances, and they must be compared with much that Green says elsewhere. I will show later that Green's method of indexing shows an attitude to continuity as distinctly in its favor. So, too, this:

> "The Church of England, as we know it to-day, is the work, so far as its outer form is concerned, of . . . Theodore of Tarsus." [7]

For the early use of the name Church of England see

---

[5] Green: *The Making of England.* Harper. Ed. 1882. Chap. 7, p. 315.
[6] Green: (Larger) *History of the English People,* Book VI, Chap. 5.
[7] Green: *Short History,* p. 65 (Harper's edition, 1882).

under King John: "Innocent the Third, who now occupied the Papal throne, had pushed its claims of supremacy over Christendom further than any of his predecessors: resolved to free the Church of England from the royal tyranny."[8]

The work of Theodore in 669 and following was "bringing the Church which was thus organized into a fixed relation to Western Christendom through its obedience to the see of Rome." "When Theodore came to organize the Church of England, the very memory of the older Christian Church which existed in Roman Britain had passed away."[9]

Of the former expressions, Freeman said:

"The 'blunder' about the fallen Church of England . . . is thoroughly characteristic of Johnny's style [J. R. Green] . . . This Church of England that now is, is legally and historically a society set up under Æthelbehrt, and not sooner or later, not under any British body, either Lucius or Henry Tudor. I pointed out as a curious instance of continuity the *congé d' élire* of Matthew Parker, which speaks of the see of Canterbury as void and desolate, or whatever the exact form is, by death of the Most Rev., etc., Cardinal Reginald Pole, etc.; that, I say, is legal and historical succession. . . . No new society is formed; but certain changes, good or bad, were made in the old society. . . . It was the Church of England all through."[10]

Freeman on Green

"Johnny Green could . . . enter into the mere beauty of an ecclesiastical story or character, but he had ever a mocking vein, which did not do."[11]

And Stubbs:

"John Richard Green, the dear friend of many amongst us, has left behind him a name which cannot soon be forgotten. His books are by themselves the warrant of the fame which he so widely gained; the extent of his reading, the power of his grasp, the clearness of his insight, the picturesque reality of his narration, are patent to all who are capable of judging. We, who knew him better than the world of his readers, knew too of his unwearied industry, his zeal for truth. . . . For

Stubbs on Green

---

[8] Same p. 149.

[9] Green: *The Making of England,* pp. 320 and 322.

[10] Stephens: *Freeman,* Vol. II, pp. 79 and 80.

[11] Same, Vol. II., p. 400. Should the scholar seek in the Index of Stephens' *Letters of John Richard Green,* 1901, for a trace of Macaulay influence over Green, he would not find it. But it appears on p. 16.

twenty years he and I were close friends; with countless differences of opinion, we never quarreled; with opposite views of the line of history and of the value of character, we never went into controversy. . . . In the joint dedication of his book I confess that I received a compliment which I place on a level with the highest honours I have ever received." [12]

[12] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures*, p. 432.

CHAPTER VIII.

STUBBS.

On Henry VIII—On the English Reformation—On the Church of England—Stubbs and Hardwick—Prothero, Freeman, Green, and Hutton on Stubbs.

Stubbs says of Henry VIII:

> "I believe him to have been a man of unbounded selfishness; a man of whom we may say . . . that he was the king, the whole king, and nothing but the king; that he wished to be, with regard to the Church of England, the pope, the whole pope, and something more than the pope. . . . You will not suspect me of making Henry VIII. the founder of the Church of England; but I do not conceal from myself that, under the Divine power which brings good out of evil, overrules the wrath of man to the praise of God, we have received good as well as evil through the means of this 'majestic lord who broke the bonds of Rome.'" [1]

In morality, or more exactly, "in this region of morality," Henry VIII. "was not better perhaps than Charles V., but he was much better than Francis I., and Philip II., and Henry IV."[2]

> "The English Church was freed from the yoke of Rome, but she retained all her framework and at least half of her old endowments. . . . She had obtained the Bible in English and the use of the chief forms of prayer in the vernacular, and was preparing for a revision in form of the Sacramental Services; she had rid herself of a mass of superstitious usages. It is true that the king remained a believer in Roman Catholic forms of doctrine; but it must always be remembered that those forms had not yet, by the Tridentine decrees, been hardened into their later inflexibility; and when we consider the terrible risks which, in the

[1] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures*, p. 301.
[2] Same, p. 333.

next reign, the Church of England ran, of losing all sense or desire of continuity, we may feel thankful that such risk was run under a weak king and feeble ministers, not under the influence of a strong will and strong hand like Henry's." [3]

Professor Stubbs says further:

"What is the Church of England? The Church of England I hold to be a portion of the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, one Church, which is the presentation of the same to us and our nation and country, and in which we and our fellow Churchmen realize our own condition as members of the mystical body of the Lord. I believe I am justified in this by the evidence which I have of the continuity of faith, of apostolic order and succession, of ministry and service."

"Up to the period of the Reformation there was no other idea of episcopacy except that of transmission of apostolic commission: that the ministry of the episcopal government could be introduced without such a link was never contemplated until in Denmark." [4]

After he became Bishop of Chester, Dr. Stubbs edited and revised a history which has been used for many years in this country. Stubbs and Hardwick, then, are jointly responsible for the following:

First are summed up three "agencies at work in producing the English Reformation"—viz, distrust and resentment at the follies and usurpations of the papacy, increased intelligence and piety in the universities, and circulation of Lutheran tracts.

"Out of these threefold agencies, combined as they have been and modified through combination, rose the complex structure known as the 'Reformed Church of England.'" These were "the impulses by which this country was aroused to indicate its independence of all foreign jurisdictions, to assert the ancient faith, and to recast the liturgy and other forms of public worship." [5]

But "the reformers secured the oneness of the Modern with the Mediæval Church of England by preserving the

[3] Same, p. 300.

[4] Hutton: *Letters of William Stubbs*, pp. 312. Compare *Visitation Charges*, 1904, pp. 68, 85, 176, 177, 193, 248, 249, 299, 314, and 342. Add *Ordination Addresses*, 1901, pp. 11, 13, 14, 15, 32, 111, 118, 119.

[5] Hardwick: *"A History of the English Church During the Reformation,"* by Charles Hardwick, M.A., late fellow of St. Catharine's College, Divinity Lecturer at King's College, and Christian Advocate in the University of Cambridge. New edition, revised by W. Stubbs, D.D., Bishop of Chester (1890); pp. 166, 167, 168, and 169.

continuity of its organization, by unbroken ties of holy orders, by innumerable traditions of thought and sentiment, of faith, of feeling, and of ritual." "Those who led the anti-papal movement had no very clear intention of proceeding further, so as to remove the mass of errors and abuses handed down from the Middle Ages." "They contended . . . . that the fabric of the papal monarchy was altogether human; that its growth was traceable partly to the favor and indulgence of the Roman Emperors, and partly to ambitious artifices of the popes themselves; that just as men originally made and sanctioned it, so might they, if occasion should arise, withdraw from it their confidence, and thus reoccupy the ground on which all Christians must have stood anterior to the Middle Ages." Hardwick names the parties contending at this and subsequent times the *Mediaeval* and the *Reforming* (called by some others the Catholic and the Protestant parties), and this certainly represents closely the spirit and intentions of the time. Mary's "accession was an augury of good to all the Mediævalists, announcing that the triumph of their party was at hand." In 1570, he says, "originated the Anglo-Roman schism"; the section is entitled "Origin of Anglo-Romanism," "which came over to disseminate the new Roman creed of Trent." "Before the expiration of the sixteenth century . . . Andrewes had become the champion of the English priesthood. . . . The spirit of destruction which in the second quarter of the century effected wonders in condemning creature worship, in uprooting theories of human merit, and expelling popery, was now at length succeeded by a deeper, calmer, more constructive spirit, one whose mission, while it counteracted errors on the right hand and on the left, was more especially to vindicate and prove the catholicity of the Church. This two-fold aspect of the Church of England and the middle place which it has occupied between the Mediæval and the merely Protestant systems, has occasioned some perplexity to our continental neighbors both Romanist and Reformed." And those Continental neighbors have their disciples in perplexity in the America of to-day. "In this country . . . the old episcopal organization was preserved inviolate, the succession of ministers was also uninterrupted; . . . Parker was felt to occupy substantially the same position as Warham, and hierarchical ideas were thus transmitted." "The practical working of the Church of England, though affected in no very sensible degree by other modifications, was severely crippled and retarded at the Reformation by the loss of her chief revenues." "No wish was manifested to re-

Hardwick

> nounce communion with past ages by repudiating hymns and creeds and prayers, the chastened collect and impassioned litany of our forefathers in Christ." [6]

In addition to the high estimates passed upon Stubbs as noted elsewhere,[7] we have these:

> "Dr. George Prothero said in his Presidential Address to the Royal Historical Society on February 20, 1902; 'Perhaps no English historian that ever lived did more to advance the knowledge of English history and to set the study on a sound basis, than Dr. Stubbs.'" [8]

Hutton's own estimate is:

> "He was notably the most original, the greatest, of the workers of whom the world gradually recognized him to be the leader. Haddan, and Freeman, and Green, and Bright, each had characteristic powers, but he seemed to combine them all: accuracy, and a deep though often silent enthusiasm, indomitable perseverance, and a wide outlook. The leadership which his friends were so proud to recognize came to him naturally, not only from his great powers of mind, but still more from his character. Its absolute loyalty and conscientiousness, its sincerity, its courage, its tolerance, made him a man to whom workers in the same field naturally looked for guidance." He was "the greatest historian of his country and age." [9]

Professor Freeman speaks of "the unerring learning and critical power of the first of living scholars." And Professor Freeman was his rival, if there could be such a thing as rivalry between two such men.

Again, Freeman said:

> "Stubbs' *Constitutional History* is a wonderful book, more like a German than an English book. In fact, I reckoned it as a German book, read him in German hours. . . . Johnny's book, on the other hand, may be read at any moment; but it is a wonderful book, too, in its way." [10]

J. R. Green, Stubbs' rival also on occasions when appointments were being made, assigns Stubbs the highest

---

[6] Same, pp. 170, 179, 186, and 187, 215 and 216, 234 and 235, 242 and 243, Note 3, 328 and 329, 337, 391 and 392.
[7] See pages 49 and 54.
[8] Hutton: *Stubbs*, p. 402.
[9] Same, p. 403.
[10] Stephens: *Freeman*, Vol. II, p. 88.

character as a historian.[11] No English historian ever received such wide recognition from the scholars of other countries. His honors were said to be countless.

[11] Hutton: *Stubbs*, pp. 137-9, 149, 60, 61, 117-120.

CHAPTER IX.

SOME OLDER WITNESSES.

TESTIMONY AS MATERIAL FOR HISTORY—SIR THOMAS BROWNE, M.D.—IZAAK WALTON—EFFORTS TO DE-CATHOLICISE THE ENGLISH CHURCH AFTER THE REFORMATION—ROBERT NELSON—DANIEL DEFOE—USSHER—JEWEL—PEARSON—SANDERSON—BULL—KEN—THE *Tracts for the Times*—CRANMER—*per contra*, HOOPER—PALMER—SUMMARY.

Summary

The proper inheritors and successors of the great line of historians noticed in the last chapter would be next in order were it not for one consideration. We have begun with Hume and his theory of a vital but restricted continuity; we have taken Macaulay, Froude, Hallam, and Dickens to show us the doctrine of a new Church; we have seen the medium or uncertain position occupied by Southey and Green; and we have shown the theory of continuity expressed by Knight, Yonge, Freeman, and Stubbs. Each reflects an opinion current in his age; each re-created opinion, and sent it forth with renewed life. We are now obliged to ascertain what authorities were back of them. Which line of opinion represents most faithfully the intentions of the reforming Church concerning itself and its own policy, and the manner in which they were understood by its members and by the public? We will go back, but not all the way back, to the Reformation for our first step in the process, and it is significant that we may begin this testimony, as several times we shall do in other lines, with the freely offered conclusions of laymen.

For testimony as to what effect upon the Church's teaching and order had been wrought by the Reformation, we naturally turn first to the writings of men who lived in the

period when religious, ritual, and ceremonial questions had largely become settled again. These are not historians, but witnesses. They show how things seemed in their day, and to some extent therefore they furnish materials in accord with which history may be written. They guard us against reading a new point of view back into the past as if it were old, or supposing that an old point of view is simply a new invention. Sir Thomas Browne, M.D., wrote *Religio Medici* about 1635, in the reign of Charles I., and authorized its publication eight years later. He thus expressed himself:

A Layman in 1635

> "For my religion . . . . I dare without usurpation assume the honorable Stile of a Christian. Not that I merely owe this Title to the Font, my Education, or the clime wherin I was born (as being bred up either to confirm those Principles my Parents instilled into my unwary Understanding, or by a general consent proceed in the Religion of my Country;) but having in my riper years and confirmed Judgment seen and examined all, I find myself obliged by the principles of Grace, and the Law of mine own Reason, to embrace no other Name but this . . . . But, because the Name of a Christian is become too general to express our Faith (there being a Geography of Religions as well as Lands), ... to be particular I am of that Reformed new-cast Religion, wherein I dislike nothing but the Name; of the same belief our Saviour taught, the Apostles disseminated, the Fathers authorized, and the Martyrs confirmed; but by the sinister ends of Princes, the ambition and avarice of Prelates, and the fatal competition of times, so decayed, impaired and fallen from its native Beauty, that it required the careful and charitable hands of these times to restore it to its primitive Integrity. . . . .
>
> At my Devotion I love to use the civility of my knee, my hat, and hand, with all those outward and sensible motions which may express or promote my invisible Devotion. . . . At the sight of a Cross or Crucifix I can dispense with my hat, but scarce with the thought or memory of my Saviour. . . . But (to difference myself nearer, and draw into a lesser Circle), there is no Church whose every part so squares unto my Conscience; whose Articles, Constitutions, and Customs seem so consonant unto reason, and as it were framed to my particular Devotion, as this whereof I hold my Belief, the Church of

Religio Medici, 1635

> England . . . where the Scripture is silent, the Church is my Text; . . . .where there is a joynt silence of both, I borrow not the rules of my Religion from Rome or Geneva, but the dictates of my own reason. . . . . It is an unjust scandal of our adversaries, and a gross errour in our selves, to compute the Nativity of our Religion from Henry the Eighth, who . . . . effected no more than what his own Predecessors desired and assayed in Ages past."[1]

The combination in Sir Thomas Browne of sentiment, faith, and reason, of loyalty with gentleness, patience, and tolerance, is so remarkable for his times or for any time that *Religio Medici* is a classic, and by some has been considered an element in a liberal education. The copy from which I have quoted was in use at Yale.

From the physician we turn to the patron of all fishermen, Izaak Walton, who died in 1683, or forty-eight years after *Religio Medici* was written. The extract given here may properly be dated 1683, because it is from Walton's will:

> "Because the profession of Christianity does at this time seem to be subdivided into Papist and Protestante, I take it to be convenient to declare my belief to be, in all points of faith, as the Church of England now professeth; and this I do the rather, because of a very long and very true friendship with some of the Roman Church."[2]

Walton tells how the priest of Bourne was ejected, and his successor proceeded thus to hold communion: A "select company" with "forms and stools about the altar for them to sit and eat and drink"; the minister bade the clerk "cease wondering (!), and lock the church-door"; to which he replied, "Pray take you the keys, and lock me out"; and "report says the old man went presently home, and died."[3] This is the kind of episode which shows the efforts of the Puritans to capture and de-Catholicise the Church, and Calvin advised them to stick to the job. For this advice they never would have asked had they not felt themselves out of har-

---

[1] Browne: *Religio Medici.* Ed. London, 1881, pp. 7-12.

[2] Walton: *Lives.* Introduction, p. 37. Plumptre: *Thomas Ken,* 1890, Vol. I., p. 24. The point here is a difficult one for some modern minds: viz., that it was possible for a Catholic to be also a Protestant. For in those days Protestantism did not mean a confusion of radically different sects as it has come to mean at the present.

[3] Walton: *Lives,* Hooker, p. 230.

mony with the English Reformation settlement. But possession is nine points of the law, and they stayed where they were, harmony or no harmony, for the sake of getting possession. An echo of their failure to adjust the Church to their desires is found in the opinions of a writer like Geikie, who confesses that the English Reformation does not suit him, admits with regret the Catholic character of the Prayer Book, calls that in the Church which he dislikes *Romish,* and charges the more loyal and exact clergy with conspiracy. It is men who argue in this way who make us think the English have no sense of humor. It is the very height of the arrogance of possession, coupled with the freaks of logic which are possible only to fanaticism. Geikie has a theory of a late introduction of the belief in Episcopal orders,[4] notwithstanding the witness of his own Church is against him, and even a Jesuit, the Rev. C. Coupe, publicly acknowledged on February 7, 1897, that the laying on of hands was never discontinued in the English Church.[5]

Robert Nelson, who died in 1715, has left us a strong argument for the Eucharist as the Christian sacrifice at the Altar on the Lord's Day.[6]

Another witness of the same sort comes down to us through the care of the famous author of *Robinson Crusoe.* Daniel Defoe preserves a paper in which he wrote of one Dicky Cronke, "the dumb philosopher, or Great Britain's wonder" who was born in Cornwall, May 29, 1718:

> "My speech is leaving me so fast that I can only tell you that I have always lived and now die an unworthy member of the ancient Catholic and Apostolic Church." "I declare myself to be a member of Christ's Church. The Church of England is doubtless the great bulwark of the ancient Catholic or Apostolic faith all over the world; a Church that has all the spiritual advantages that the nature of a Church is capable of . . . . I . . . . declare for the satisfaction of you and your friends, as I have always lived, so I

---

[4] Geikie: *The English Reformation,* 1879, p. xii.

[5] Collins: *The English Reformation and Its Consequences,* 1901, p. 38.

[6] T. T. Carter: *The Holy Eucharist,* p. 50. A remarkable parallel is the Scriptural and historical presentation of this matter in Abraham: *The Position of the Eucharist in Public Worship,* 1906; and Butler: *How Shall We Worship God?* 1904, Chap. VI., on "The Answer of the English Reformation."

now die, a true and sincere though a most unworthy, member of it."

We will now turn to the impressions of the clergy. The purpose of the *Tracts for the Times* in the Oxford or Tractarian movement of 1833 and after, was to make clear that there has been an unbroken stream of Catholic testimony, the result of continuity of the Church of England, showing her teaching one and the same in essentials, before and after the Reformation. This testimony was collected and published in the tracts. So famous are they as a historical document that it would seem unnecessary either to do again this work, or to recall attention to it. But it is just this which some historians have forgotten. The testimony was called *catena patrum,* the Chain of Fathers. To give some idea of the kinds of teaching which are used as links in such a chain to bind age to age, take Archbishop Ussher, who on June 20, 1674, said:

> "We bring in no new faith nor no new Church. *That which in the time of the ancient Fathers was accounted to be 'truly and properly Catholic,' namely, that which was believed everywhere, always, and by all, hath in the succeeding ages evermore been preserved, and at this day entirely professed in our Church."* [1]

As our purpose is only approximately the same as the purpose of the famous *Tracts,* I will not continue to quote from them, although their entire set of extracts tends to strengthen the teaching which I will gather from the original sources. I will take out a few lines from various writers and arrange them by dates. In 1565, Bishop Jewel said:

> "We have returned to the Apostles and old Catholic fathers." "The title of antiquity (*i. e.,* Catholic) is shaken out of their hands." "We believe that there is one Church of *GOD* . . . . that is catholic . . . . and dispersed throughout the whole world."
>
> "We believe that there be priests." . . . . "The Supper is the Communion of the body and blood of CHRIST." "We make our prayers in that tongue which all our people may understand; . . . . and all the holy

[1] *Tracts for the Times,* Vol. III, p. 443 (American Reprint, New York, 1840). Compare Russell: *Dr. Pusey,* 1907, in the series "Leaders of the Church, 1800-1900," p. 36.

fathers and Catholic Bishops did use to pray themselves, and taught the people to pray too."

"Surely we have ever judged the primitive Church of CHRIST's time, of the Apostles', and of the holy fathers', to be the *Catholic Church:* neither make we doubt to fix therein the whole means of our salvation."[8] And in 1571: "How can we with clear conscience come unto the holy communion of *Christ's* most holy body and blood, if we are not in charity with our own neighbor."[9]

Dr. John Donne's will, which was sealed December 13, 1630, says:

"I, John Donne, by the mercy of Christ Jesus, and by the calling of the Church of England, Priest."[10]

Bishop Pearson says in 1658:

"That Church alone which first began at Jerusalem . . . . and that alone began there, which always embraceth 'the faith once delivered to the saints' . . . . Whatsoever Church pretendeth a new beginning, pretendeth at the same time to a new Churchdom, and whatsoever is so new is none. So necessary it is to believe in the *holy catholick church* . . . . I am fully persuaded, and make a free confession of this . . . that Christ, by the preaching of the apostles, did gather unto Himself a Church, consisting of thousands of believing persons and numerous congregations, to which He daily added such as should be saved, and will successively and daily add to the same until the end of the world: so that by virtue of His all-sufficient promise, I am assured that there was, hath been hitherto, and now is, and hereafter shall be, so long as the sun and moon endure, a Church of Christ one and the same."[11]

The passage from Pearson used in the *Tracts* is from his preface:

"As our religion is Catholick, it holdeth fast that faith

[8] Jewel: *Apology for the Church of England,* 3, 9, 6, 7, 6, 10, 6, 16, 8, 2. Add to this Fuller: *Life of Bishop Davenant, 1572-1641,* pp. 523 and 524, and Ottley: *Lancelot Andrewes, 1555-1626,* 1894, p. 164; Godwin: *A Catalogue of the Bishops of England,* 1615, and Godwin: *Annales of England,* 1630. The *Catalogue* is in the G. T. S. Library, New York, the *Annales* is in the N. H. State Library. These are the connecting links with Burnet's History (pub. 1679) leading to Hume (1776) and the modern line (Knight, Macaulay, and others) with which we began.

[9] Whittingham: *Standard Works,* New York, 1831, p. 10. Mr. Whittingham was later the fourth Bishop of Maryland. At this time he was 26 years of age, and copied out the entire work of Jewel with his own hand, so important did he consider it for the education of the young American Church. This was *before* the *Oxford Movement.*

[10] Walton: *Lives,* p. 103. Ed. Boston, 1860.

[11] Pearson: *An Exposition of the Creed.* New York and Philadelphia, Appleton, 1844. Article 9, p. 524, and from the address of Pearson "To the Reader."

> which was once delivered to the saints, and since preserved in the Church . . . . in opposition to . . . (those) who have preverted the Articles of our Creed, and found out followers . . . who have enacted a new body of divinity in opposition to the Catholick theology . . . The reader . . . . may see . . . . what he is by the Church of God understood to profess, when he maketh this public, ancient, and orthodox confession of faith." [12]

Dr. Robert Sanderson (Bishop of Winchester) died in 1662, and left a will in which he said:

> "As I have lived, so I desire, and—by the grace of God—resolve, to die in the communion of the Catholic Church of Christ, and a true son of the Church of England; which . . . . to be both in doctrine and worship agreeable to the Word of God . . . . conformable to the faith and practice of the godly Churches of Christ in the primitive and purer times, I do firmly believe; led not so much from the force of custom and education . . . . as upon the clear evidence of truth and reason, after a serious and impartial examination of the grounds as well of Popery as Puritanism." [13]

Bishop Bull said in 1671:

> "The question is here the same with that threadbare one which the Papists use to reiterate, ... Where was your Church before LUTHER? To which the answer is easy: Our Church was then where it is now, even here in ENGLAND. She hath not changed one thing of what she held before, any way pertaining either to the being or well-being of a church . . . . She still retains the same common rule of faith . . . . She retaineth the same apostolical government of bishops, priests, and deacons." [14] And at about the same period: that the present Roman doctrines of Trent are "most contrary to the doctrines of the Catholic Church." "Our Church and the pastors thereof did always acknowledge the same rule of faith, the same fundamental articles of the Christian religion both before and since the Reformation." [15]

In this volume of his works, one discourse is on the teachings of the Catholic Church (the Church in which he was a ruler and teacher), one is an instruction on the proper way to read the service and in this, incidentally, he speaks

---

[12] *Tracts for the Times,* Catena Patrum No. III., Am. Ed., p. 468.
[13] Izaak Walton: *Lives,* p. 367.
[14] Bull: *Works,* Vol. II, p. 206; in *"A Vindication of the Church of England."* The date is St. Luke's Day, Oct. 18, 1671.
[15] The same, p. 205.

of the Church's intention to have Morning Prayer and Holy Communion every Sunday. In Sermon XIII. he speaks of "the prayer of oblation of the Christian sacrifice in the holy Eucharist." In the same he says the English Liturgy conforms to the law observed by the Catholic Church. He writes on "the corruptions of the Church of Rome," and says:

> "But Monsieur de Meaux seems to think the Roman and the Catholic Church to be convertible terms, which is strange in so learned a man, especially at this time of day." "By the catholic church I mean the Church universal . . . . all the churches throughout the world, who retain the faith once delivered to the saints . . . . not a confused heap of societies, separated one from another." He will not admit that either the Church of Rome or the Church of England is the entire Catholic Church, because a part is not the whole. The independence of the English Church was recovered and resumed in Henry the Eighth's reign as a primitive right "without breach of catholic unity." [16]

Bull

Bull wrote a long Latin treatise in support of the Catholic Church. Its opening words are: "First I give the witness of the very first fathers. Ignatius was but a step from John the Apostle." The whole appeal is to the Catholic character and inheritance by continuity in the English Church.[17]

Bishop Bull in 1714 published a sermon prepared many years before for his clergy, on the priestly office, in which repeatedly the minister is called priest. No proof of the priesthood is offered, the Bishop simply makes free use of the word and assumes that all will understand it.[18]

"I dye," wrote the good old English saint, Thomas Ken:

> "I dye in the holy Catholic and Apostolic faith, professed by the whole Church before the disunion of East and West; more particularly, I dye in the communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papall and Puritan innovations, and as it adheres to the doctrine of the Cross." [19]

---

[16] The same, pp. 238, 242, and 244.
[17] The same, Vol. 6, pp. 14-235.
[18] The same, Vol. I, Sermon VI.
[19] Ken: (d 1711). In *Russell: The Household of Faith,* 1902, p. 329. And Plumptre: *Thomas Ken,* 1890, Vol. II, p. 209. And Clarke: *Thomas Ken,* 1896, p. 223, in series "Leaders of Religion." See forward, p. 206 *ff.*

It is sometimes said that the Catholic "pretences" of the English Church, along with Apostolic succession and continuity, were invented or discovered by the Oxford Movement in the thirties of the century just gone by. This I have found accepted as fact by a great many teachers, who teach accordingly. My own extracts, with the whole argument of the *Tracts* will abundantly show that this opinion and teaching must be revised.

In 1839, one of the generally-well-read scholars of the day, the Rev. Henry Thompson, wrote:

> "You ask me my opinion of the Oxford Tracts. To say that I have not derived instruction and benefit from them would betoken a want of comprehension, or a want of humility, or both. I say not so: I am deeply grateful for the edification they have brought to me, as well as to the Church at large. But I can say with Dr. Hook that they have not taught me any new *principle:* their views, in the main, are the views that have ever been entertained by all well-read Churchmen." [20]

It is something of a literary curiosity that the *Tracts for the Times* did not furnish dates with the names of their authorities. The force of the chain in each instance depends upon link grasping link, but each reader was obliged to furnish for himself the dates showing the forward steps in this powerful argument. It is on this account that the *Tracts* have lost some of their force in the reckonings of later and minor historians.

The series *Catena Patrum,* or Chain of the Fathers, was made up of five subjects. Number 1 gave 43 successive authorities (bridging the period from the Reformation to living memory) on the Apostolic succession. Number 2 gave 41 authorities for Baptismal Regeneration, or Christ's work in Baptism. Number 3 gave 39 authorities for the duty of supporting the universal teaching of the Christian Church (a plea against the attempt to construct an entire system of religion anew from a single person's experience, or from the experience of a small group of similar individuals). Number 4 gave 62 authorities for the Eucharistic Sacrifice. And Number 5 gave some 24 authorities for the obligation of a

[20] Stephens: *Freeman,* Vol. I, pp. 23 and 24. Cf. Carter: *Undercurrents of Church Life in the Eighteenth Century,* 1899.

priest to have in his parish church daily morning and evening prayer for his people.

For the various Catholic ideas and customs there are 62 authorities in *Catenae* Nos. I, II, and III, and 34 others in Russell; making nearly 100. This simply shows how vast is the literature which we have to pass over, sample, or indicate.

As we look at the earlier names in this list, we are impressed by the need of a treatment of what we might call the English Reformation and subsequent teaching *from within.* What did the Reformers intend to do? The kind of treatment required to enable us to answer this question intelligently would be a collection of statements from men of the times on the various reforms proposed, and the supposed general drift or result of the movement. It would be dry reading. Of the period treated in this chapter, nearly all the prose is dry. *That is why its materials are not now more generally known.* And that is why teachers are sometimes found teaching the English Reformation without knowing very much about it. It is an age of source books; let us have a Source Book of the English Reformation. For a movement may be judged by its results; but primarily it is guided by the intentions of its leaders. Reference must be made to the original intentions, and to the fidelity of those who carried on their work. The movement is most true to itself where these intentions have been assumed and acted upon. Its final work is the restraint of the extremes of individual theory by corporate action.

Cranmer wrote in 1537:

> "Since this Catholic faith which we hold respecting the Real Presence has been declared to the Church from the beginning by such evident and manifest passages of Scripture, and the same has also been subsequently commended to the ears of the faithful with so much clearness and diligence by the first ecclesiastical writers; do not, I pray, persist in wishing any longer to carp at or subvert a doctrine so well grounded and supported."

But Bishop Hooper was of the Scotch mode, entirely disbelieved baptismal regeneration and the Real Presence, and says "the religion of Christ just now budding forth in

England." He would abolish the Mass, and destroy the altars. He opposed the vestments; considers the Pope not even a member of the Church of Christ. Sir John Cheke says in 1553 that Edward has "abolished the mass." Another: "Being questioned respecting the mass, he said, that those who regard the mass as a sacrifice for the dead are opposed to Christ," but "with respect to the presence, he said, that Christ was really and corporally present in the sacrament; but . . . . it is a very corrupt custom to carry about the sacrament to be adored."[21]

A mass of testimony has been collected to show that the reformers and early post-Reformation clergy held to the principle of the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.[22] We will not quote it here, but indicate it simply to show that quite common teaching about an abolished Mass or Real Presence is also quite mistaken, and that material exists for library work enabling the conscientious and hard-working teacher to obtain something larger than the current one-sided statements on this subject.

William Palmer's *Treatise on the Church* was published fifty years before such a critic and leader as Dean Church could call it "an honour to English theology and learning; in point of plan and structure we have few books like it. It . . . commanded the respect of Dr. Döllinger. It is also one on which the highest value has been set by Mr. Gladstone."[23] The former said "that he would consider a new edition of the book 'an event for Christendom.' Mr. Gladstone agreed with him."[24]

Palmer says:

> "It is my design . . . . to examine the reformation of the Church of Great Britain and Ireland, to trace its conformity with the faith and discipline of the catholic church . . . . The real facts of the Reformation in England have been so misrepresented from ignorance or design[25] that

---

[21] Parker Society: Original Letters relative to the English Reformation, Cambridge, 1846, pp. 14, 70-79, 91, 105, 151, and 152.

[22] Malcolm MacColl: *The Reformation Settlement,* 10th edition, 1901, pp. 139-160.

[23] Church: *The Oxford Movement.* Ed. of 1891, p. 129.

[24] MacColl: *The Ref. Settlement in the Light of History and Law,* 8th edition, 1900, pp. 108, 154.

[25] The same allegation is made in Westcott: *Catholic Principles,* p. 165.

. . . . [it] merits . . . . a more attentive study. . . . . The church of England was not founded at the Reformation, nor separated from the catholic church, nor was its faith changed . . . . nor was the doctrine of the Reformation a new and unknown gospel; nor is it possible, on any principle of reason or justice, to identify the church of England with all the sins, errors, and vices of those temporal rulers who supported its reformation . . . That men of unsanctified characters have frequently been made instrumental in performing works beneficial to the Church, must be admitted . . . . The character of Constantine the Great was stained by serious offenses, yet he established Christianity in the Roman empire. Clovis, the first Christian King of the Franks; Phocas, who conferred on the Roman patriarch the title of œcumenical Bishop; the Empress Irene, who established the worship of images; many of the Roman pontiffs themselves; and even some of those who were most zealous to extend their jurisdiction, were all guilty of great and terrible crimes. The Emperor Napoleon restored Christianity in France, yet it will not be pretended that his character was one of much sanctity . . . . Although Henry and the protector Somerset may have been secretly influenced by avarice, revenge, or other evil passions, they never made them public. They avowed as their reasons for supporting reformation, the desire of removing usurpations, establishing the ancient rights of the church and the crown, correcting various abuses prejudicial to true religion; and therefore the church could not refuse to take into consideration the specific objects of reformation proposed by them to her examination or sanction . . . . It was the essential principle of the English Reformation throughout, that the doctrine and tradition of the catholic church of Christ, *in all ages,* were to be obediently followed . . . Even the Parliament, which suppressed Papal jurisdiction, declared, 'that they did not hereby intend to vary from Christ's church, about the articles of the catholic faith of Christendom.' . . . .The church of England, in 1543, declared the unity of the catholic church to consist chiefly in unity of *doctrine;* and that particular churches ought not to vary from one another in the said doctrine, so accepted and allowed. And in 1562, the synod of London declared, that 'the church has authority in controversies of faith.' Accordingly, when Cranmer appealed to a general council, against the judgment of the Roman pontiff, his language was this: 'I intend to speak nothing against one holy, catholic and apostolical church, or the authority thereof, the

which authority I have in great reverence, and to whom my mind is *in all things to obey*' . . . . And again: 'I protest that it was never in my mind to write, speak, or understand anything contrary to the most holy word of God, or else against the holy catholic church of Christ.' The ritual, Articles, and discipline of the Church of England do not rest merely on temporal authority, but on the original sanction and subsequent practice and custom of the catholic churches of these realms." Palmer shows from Cranmer's words that in his Reformation teaching he appealed to the ancient Christianity and "the old Church." Palmer then gives thirty-two names of writers of authority, and says there are "others innumerable of our primates, bishops, doctors, and theologians, who have all maintained the authority of catholic tradition." "The act (1547) appointing communion in both kinds, and the people to receive it with the priest, went on the ground of 'the practice of the church for five hundred years after Christ' and 'the primitive practice' . . . At the end of [the first] book of Homilies, we read of 'the due receiving of Christ's body and blood under the form of bread and wine.' . . . . The *authorized doctrine* of the church of England, during the whole of Edward the Sixth's reign, was that of the real presence, in the strongest and most decided sense . . . Bishop Ridley protested that . . . he did not mean 'to remove that real presence of Christ's body in His supper, duly and lawfully administered, which is founded in the word of God and illustrated by the commentaries of the orthodox fathers.'

"During the reign of Edward VI. the church made no alteration in doctrine, except in leaving the mode of real presence in the eucharist undetermined. . . . Considerable alterations in rites and ceremonies were effected, but in this there is not the slightest proof of heretical variation. The removal of *images* specially abused by superstitious or idolatrous worship, was merely following up the practice already sanctioned by the Church in the preceding reign. The subsequent removal of all images, by order of the council of 1548, was grounded on the tumults and disorders which there were at that time about them; and the church, in acquiescing in this regulation, did so under the conviction that they were unnecessary to true piety, and liable to the grossest abuses. *The administration of the eucharist in both kinds* (approved by the convocation of the church) was not *inconsistent* with the doctrine of the real presence . . . but was founded on 'primitive practice' . . . . The permission *of the marriage of the clergy* was a mere change of discipline, and perfectly lawful . . . . and the publica-

Palmer

tion of *the ritual in the English language,* corrected and reformed, must be allowed by every one to have been most perfectly within the office of the church. As to the abolition of various *ceremonies,* such as *carrying candles, ashes, palms, the paschal sepulchre, creeping to the cross, oil, chrism,* etc., it was effected by the church, not on principles condemnatory of her former practice, but because these rites were abused to superstition and idolatry, and the abuses could not be removed without removing their objects; or because they were too numerous and burdensome. These are principles to which it is impossible that any catholic can object, and of their application the church is the proper judge."

The "formularies are not so worded as to evince any great or irreconcilable opposition between the public and authorized faith of the church of England in the reign of Henry VIII. and in that of Elizabeth."

"The real identity of the church consists in her preservation of the catholic faith revealed by God and taught in all ages by the universal church; and in the retention of those rites and that government of the church which are of divine institution, or were instituted in all churches by the apostles. While these essentials are preserved, the identity of the church continues, and it is not affected by the introduction or removal of certain jurisdictions of human origin, by varieties in the external forms of worship, or by the prevalence of abuses or corruptions in doctrine amongst the people. The existence of serious errors, nay even of idolatry and heresy, does not destroy the identity of a church, unless all its members are obliged, as such, to profess idolatry or heresy . . . . "

"The supremacy of the Roman see was for a long time admitted generally amongst us, as it was in other western churches; but this was merely a mistaken opinion, it was not a heresy, and therefore its popular reception, or its rejection, did not affect the identity of the church . . . .The identity of the church does not depend on the use of particular habits, or the celebration of the office in a particular part of the church, or the use of a stone altar in preference to a wooden table; . . . . abuses induced the church to exchange the appellation of 'the mass' for that of the 'Holy Communion'; but the essentials of this most holy service, which had always been preserved, were comprised in the reformed rites. . . . . It may be concluded, then, that the church of England always continued to exist, and that the Reformation did not destroy its identity."

"The Confession of Augsburg says: 'Our Churches are

> falsely accused of abolishing the mass, for the mass is retained among us and celebrated with the greatest reverence, and almost all the accustomed ceremonies are preserved'; . . . . The Apology of the Confession says: 'It must be premised that we do not abolish the mass, but religiously retain and defend it. Masses are celebrated among us on all Sundays and other feasts.'" [26]

Summary

From the beginning of the Reformation to its end, there is a line of teachers who never abandoned the Catholic plan of the Church. This was not merely a volunteer school or party within the Church, but was a regular and officially recognized line of thought and course of action. For these men had on their side the great weight of the Prayer Book, which men of other parties as well as themselves were bound to use. Traditional ornaments, such as altar lights, crosses, chasubles, were not specifically mentioned, and a great many traditional ceremonies were left to their fate; but the Catholic Creeds, sacraments, and orders were rigidly preserved. In the case of the sacraments and orders, ceremonies were made obligatory in order to emphasize the character of the teaching intended to be preserved. In this school it was intended obviously that all clergy and congregations were to be trained. Outside of the specified requirements, ceremonies might lawfully be varied, either simplified or elaborated at the convenience of clergy and people. The Catholic teachers and people might differ among themselves according as the aims tended to simplicity or richness. But the one great characteristic of the surviving Catholic teachers was their loyalty to the settlement and to the existing standards in which were written the Catholic ideals of the English Church. Side by side with them, on the Episcopal bench and in the priesthood, were men with instincts only half Catholic or even anti-Catholic. These men, as was required of them, made use of the Prayer Book with its Catholic teachings, although with much of it they were in disagreement. It was good for both parties that these men, though at heart aliens to the Church as an ideal, found tolerance. The model, the teachings, the ideals of the Church

[26] Palmer: *Treatise on the Church*, 3d ed., London, 1842. Vol. I, p. 325, 326, 329, 344, 345, 376, 380, 381, 383, 389, 390, 394, 395, 401, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 416. note.

were officially stated as distinctly high Catholic, and in administration this was combined with the policy and practice of tolerance. It is but natural that many should mistake the party opinions of the tolerated dissenters for the voice of the Church itself. It is but natural that the party of the minimum should be supposed, and should sometimes suppose itself, to be the exponent of the true Church idea, instead of being merely tolerated Whatever injury could be done by permitting external assent to coexist with internal dissent was a possible injury to the individual only, but in any case a possible injury to which the individual submits intelligently for the sake of his own training, his influence, and his place in the home and family of Christ. The Church of England, in short, combined a policy of teaching a message and a practice, with a policy of leaving much in religion to the determination of the individual and as an object of personal and prolonged trial. Whatever comes safely out of such a test lasting for many centuries is at once seen to be a survival of the best, and the free-will and reasonable acceptation of the multitude who essayed the test. The witness of the English Church to Catholic truth is therefore strong because it is free.

Something of the meaning of continuity in the Catholic teachers may be seen in a list such as the following:[27]

1534. Church of England denies to Church of Rome an universal jurisdiction.

	BORN—DIED
Bishop John Jewel	1522—1571
Bishop Thomas Bilson	1536—1616
Bishop Thomas Morton	1564—1659
Bishop John Pearson	1613—1686
Bishop George Bull	1634—1710
Bishop Thomas Wilson	1663—1755
Thomas Randolph	1710—1783
Bishop Samuel Horsley	1733—1806
Rev. John Keble, Senior	1745—1835
Rev. Martin J. Routh	1755—1854
Rev. John Keble	1792—1866
Rev. T. T. Carter	1808—1901
King, Bishop of Lincoln	1829—
Winnington-Ingram, Bishop of London	1858—

[27] See G. W. E. Russell: *The Household of Faith,* paper on "Catholic Continuity," pp. 330-343.

CHAPTER X.

ROMAN EXPRESSIONS AND THEIR VALUE.

LINGARD—ACTON—GASQUET—DUCHESNE—THE MASS NOT ALWAYS THE SAME—THE VOICE OF THE POPES NOT ALWAYS THE SAME—THE CHARACTER AND POLICY OF THE POPES PROMOTE THE REFORMATION—CARDINAL GIBBONS AS A HISTORIAN—CONTRADICTED BY ROMAN CATHOLIC HISTORIANS—CITES RANKE, WHO CONTRADICTS HIM—EFFECTS OF HIS THEORIES—WILBOIS ON THE CATHOLIC ORTHODOX RUSSIAN CHURCH—LORD ACTON—THE DIFFICULTIES OF HISTORIANS IN THE ROMAN CHURCH—VON DÖLLINGER—HEFELE.

The great Roman Catholic History of England is Lingard's. Briefly, it says:

> "By the adoption of the thirty-nine articles the seal was put on the Reformation in England. A new church was built on the ruins of the old; and it will be the object of this note to point out to the reader how far these churches agreed, how far they disagreed in their respective creeds." He calls the articles "a national creed," "the standard of English orthodoxy."[1]

Lingard

I do not find Lingard in use except in Roman Catholic schools, and perhaps in a very few others for reference. But it is in most libraries.

The great Roman Catholic historian of recent days is Lord Acton. Lord Acton speaks of "the new Church"; of "those qualities which, in the Anglican Church, redeem in part the guilt of its origin"; says that "Sir Nicholas Bacon was one of the ministers who suppressed the Mass in England."[2]

---

[1] Lingard: *History of England,* Edition of 1838, pp. 384, 318. Edition of 1869, Vol. VII, p. 393, appendix note.

[2] *The History of Freedom and Other Essays,* by John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton. Ed. with an introduction by John Neville Figgis, M.A., and Reginald Vere Laurence, M.A., both of Cambridge. 1907; pp. 330, 261, and 44.

An Italian work says:

> "that the Church of England has adopted all the dogmas of Calvin, but preserved the episcopate," and "is divided into Calvinist, Methodist, and Evangelical and . . . . dates from Henry VIII." It was "instituted in 1562 under Elizabeth." Calvinists are known in France as Huguenots, in Scotland as Presbyterians, in Germany as Evangelicals, in England as Anglicans. They have no *liturgical rite, no priest, no festivals, no cross.*[3] This book is used in Italy as an educational work and book of reference, and has a wide circulation.

I will now take up several Roman Catholic historical writers for the purpose of bringing out new expressions, views and estimates of matters related to the Reformation, with some light on the achievements in the field of historical writing which are to stand against the names of some of the more conspicuous Roman Catholic writers.

First, the Roman Catholic

Dom Gasquet

has, with Edmund Bishop, written a history of the English Church Prayer Book.

> "According to the traditional and universal practice of Christendom the mass, by whatever name it may be called, was the great public service of worship. To it all other offices were subordinate and accessary." And: "The Communion office, 'commonly called the Mass,' is the chief element in determining the character of the new Prayer Book, and although the undue prominence which has in fact been given to the morning and evening prayer during the past three centuries has somewhat obscured the central act of Christian worship, its importance will hardly now be called in question, and in the middle of the sixteenth century it could not have been doubted."[4]

Gasquet

And this is precisely the judgment of another great liberal Roman Catholic:

---

[3] E. J. Treble in *The Church Times*, Aug. 31, 1908. *Il Novuissimo Melzi-Dizionario Completo, parte linguistica e parte scientifico*, revised ed. Pub. Villardi, Rome, Naples, and Milan. Compare Wakeman: *History of the Church of England*, 6th ed., 1899, p. 328.

[4] Gasquet: *Edward VI. and the Book of Common Prayer*, 2d edition, 1891, pp. 189 and 216.

Mivart

"We . . . . see how great a mistake is made by those who imagine that the difference between the pre-Reformation and post-Reformation services was as great as the difference between a service in an ordinary Anglican and a Roman Catholic church of the present day. The services attended continued to be under Elizabeth—as they had been under Henry—Matins, Communion, and Evensong." [5]

Again:

Gasquet

"The liturgies created by the reformation fall naturally into two classes: the Lutheran and the Reformed. Of these . . . . the general character of the 'Reformed' liturgies is quite different from the Anglican office . . . . since it is a principle of the Reformed liturgies to obliterate as far as possible every trace of the ancient Mass." He says Cranmer's English book showed Lutheran "influence," but "was extremely distasteful" to the Lutheran agents. Cranmer was trying to check off his views by consulting and transcribing the views of the early Christian Fathers. Gasquet says the Prayer Book is "the liturgy now holding the affection of the majority of Englishmen."

Gasquet's best book proves first of all that old Protestant histories of the Reformation, like Burnet's, on which so many Protestant ministers of the present day have founded their traditional views, must be discarded in face of new and strong evidence. An immense amount of this evidence is here brought forward. The result is unquestionably a new view of the Reformation. The book was received with praise on all sides, by English and Roman writers, by religious, literary, and daily papers. And Gasquet makes it clear that the suppression of the monasteries began with Cardinal Wolsey under papal bulls from Clement VII. Ambition first, then greed, were the motives. The robbery thus begun under highest Roman sanction was ended and endorsed under Queen Mary and the bulls of the Pope in her time. It is a matter of the highest importance that these responsibilities should be placed where they belong. The moving cause was not in the immorality of the monasteries, but in the ambition and greed of the Roman Cardinal. Wolsey's revenues were

[5] St. George Mivart: *Essays and Criticisms*, 1892, p. 247.
[6] Gasquet: *Edward VI.*, etc., pp. 217, 228, 232, 233.

thought equal to the revenues of the Crown. Wolsey worked for the king's divorce. When the king had no wife, greed still carried him on. Greed was the motive of Henry and his agents in slandering the monasteries, and the reward was, say $75,000,000, for Henry and his political machine.[7] This starts an interesting and profitable line of thought. Are we not to-day reckoning with some of the results of Cardinal Wolsey's policy? Great social forces set loose nearly four hundred years ago have not been entirely corrected or reversed by the action of time. The immediate results were the increase of poverty, the neglect of the sick and poor, the enlargement, if not the creation, and support of an aristocracy of wealth and ease, the separation of classes, the formation of something like a class monopoly of land with legal traditions in its favor, all of which connect, by the laws of cause and effect, the spoliation of the Church by Cardinal Wolsey and Henry VIII. with many of the social difficulties of the present day.

Gasquet is extremely interesting as giving a new Roman Catholic estimate of the value of other historians. Of James Gairdner he says, "His conclusions must carry great weight."[8] Time after time he gives Gairdner the highest praise. From Blunt and Canon Dixon, historians of the English Church, he recognizes gratefully that the monasteries have had justice. Dixon he calls "earnest, truthful, just." Froude he mentions often with that indignation which one measures out to those consciously and passionately unjust. Green he criticises unfavorably, while admitting the splendid character of his history; Seebohm he criticises severely.

Gasquet's attitude on the matters here noted should be known to teachers who may have occasion to meet the common Roman Catholic view, and his estimate of historians should be a hint to librarians. For, in supplying most libraries, his order of merit would be practically reversed.

Gasquet's next book is chiefly remarkable for its utter forgetfulness of the provocation which drove Luther upon his course; for a brilliantly successful effort to vindicate the

[7] Gasquet: *Henry the Eighth and the English Monasteries*, 1889.
[8] Same, preface to popular edition, 1899, p. 6.

Romanism of Erasmus at the expense of Julius II. and his court; the Good Friday sermon recorded is paganism enough at the heart of Rome to justify reformation in all lands. These important preliminaries to the Reformation are readily admitted as causes by Lord Acton. The suppression of evidence in the case of Scotland is enough to throw suspicion on the rosy picture of almost universal satisfaction in England before the Reformation. Nothing whatever is said of the Papacy's burdensome taxation. The changes all came from Henry's desire for a divorce; a theory at variance with the theory put forth in the same author's *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries,* where the motive throughout appears as greed. It must be a matter of great regret that a historian who in other books has so highly commended himself to all parties should in this work[9] of vast labor and weighty evidence be so far forgetful of great and necessary facts bearing upon the Reformation. If the Roman Church was in a satisfactory condition before the Reformation, how do we account for the fact that the cry for reformation was everywhere heard in the Roman Church? A modern incident throws some light upon those times:

"According to Cardinal Manning, Pius IX. said that the destruction of the monasteries in Italy was a blessing in disguise."[10]

Abbe Duchesne.

Here we will introduce a Roman Catholic authority to bear upon the popular idea of unchangeableness and uniformity in the Roman Church. Teachers would bring two strong impressions out of Duchesne's great study of Christian worship:

(1) The Roman Mass is not the only Mass.

(2) Variation of the Mass is not abolition of the Mass.[11]

Both these are contrary to fixed ideas, but the Abbé proves the thesis in each case. They are just the two propositions which were well known to Englishmen at the time of

[9] Gasquet: *The Eve of the Reformation,* 1901; pp. 204 and 205, *et al.*

[10] Collins: *The Reformation and its Consequences,* p. 39.

[11] Duchesne: *Origin and Evolution of Christian Worship,* translated and published by the S. P. C. K., 1903.

the English Reformation, and on these principles the Reformers acted.

> "The history of the foundation of the English Church is known to us." He begins it in A. D. 597 as the English Church historians do, and he calls it the English Church, though from its relations to Rome he calls it also Roman. He further pleads the capacity of the Roman Church to reform itself, and he looks forward, on this basis, to a future unity. The questions internal to the Roman Church which are bound to precede the unity which he expects, he does not discuss. But plainly the English must feel that in Duchesne and his followers they have friends and allies.[12]

Some other fixed ideas and popular mistakes are rather roughly shaken by the same author in yet another book:

1. One is the mental association of priesthood with celibacy. This is an impression very widespread in this country. Pupils will be much surprised to learn that as celibacy has really nothing to do with priesthood essentially, so the marriage of the clergy would not by itself destroy priesthood nor be an evidence that priesthood had been destroyed or lost. We must avoid the mistake of presenting priesthood to the pupil as something neither more nor less than celibacy. For, as there may be bachelors and celibates who are not priests, so there may be priests who are not celibates. The English Church, like other Churches, allowed, at various times before as well as after the Reformation, a married priesthood. The condition in the Roman Church will prove a trifle more startling. Duchesne says:

> "The wives of the superior orders of clergy shared, to a certain extent, in the promotion of their husbands, becoming diaconae, presbyterae, or episcopae"—deaconesses, priestesses, and—shall it be written?—*bishopesses!* Duchesne
>
> "On the day of the clerk's preferment to the priesthood . . . . their wives (it is not good English, but so it reads) were also honored with a kind of consecration ceremony in celebration of this access of dignity."[13]

---

[12] Duchesne: *The Churches Separated from Rome*, tr. by A. H. Mathew, 1907, p. 1. "It is difficult to see how a loyal Roman Catholic could really go further than M. Duchesne went. *Every argument* against Anglican Orders *was set aside.* There remained in the field not one."—Prof. Moberly (Oxford U.): *Ministerial Priesthood*, 1900, p. 234.

[13] Duchesne: *The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes, A.D. 754-1073.* By Mgr. L. Duchesne, D.D., Director of the Ecole Francaise at

Lord Acton quotes the remark of a Roman Catholic in Germany: "We were used to married priests so long that it is the law of celibacy which we feel as an innovation."[14]

Cardinal Wolsey himself had a son and a daughter.[15] Archbishop Warham possibly had a wife and several children in 1518.[16]

It is quite questionable whether these children were in law on the same footing as the children of a regularly married priesthood. And it is certain these Cardinals could not have advanced in their callings without more or less repudiating their wives, perhaps more and more as they advanced. The situation was so unfair all around that it simply ceased to be moral. And thus certainly one cause of continued English distrust of Rome was a colossal insincerity existing by common consent at the heart of Rome, and imitated elsewhere, as it was on a large scale in Scotland.

Marriage of the Clergy

2. Another common prejudice which is banished by the eminent Roman scholar Duchesne in the same book, is an expectation of an unchanging attitude towards matters such as Rome's conception of English orders. The fact is, Rome can of course make a change at any time. Mgr. Duchesne points out a precedent. The Orders conferred by Pope Formosus were refused recognition by Pope Stephen VI., Sergius III., and John X. This decision, bound by a threefold tie, was reversed or treated as a dead letter by later Popes.[17]

Rome's Decision Reversed

3. And similarly, other passages in the same book dispel the illusion that all was well at Rome; and lead us to ask, If the head was thus, what of the members? And how could the influence abroad, in the other national Churches,

---

Rome, authorized translation from the French by Arnold Harris Mathew, 1908. It bears the mark of the papal censor and of the Bishop. Chapter VI., pp. 65 and 66.

[14] Acton: *Historical Essays and Studies*, 1907, p. 10.

[15] See Brewer: *The Reign of Henry VIII.*, 1884, Vol. II, pp. 458-461, and pp. 102-104; *Williams on the English Reformation*, p. 93, note.

[16] Wordsworth: *The Ministry of Grace*, 1901, p. 238.

[17] Duchesne: *The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes*, pp. 207, 213.

be other than bad? And was it not just this condition that made the Reformation inevitable?[18]

Acton again agrees. He gives as "an almost immediate cause of the Reformation, the policy of Pope Alexander VI., in making the prerogative of the Holy See profitable and exchangeable in the political market." This was the usurpation and immorality which Luther assailed. There is a long list of Papal divorces.[19] And he argued, says his editor, "that the Popes were individually and collectively responsible for the policy of persecution in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries."[20]

Lord Acton's criticism of Creighton was that he was too lenient in his judgments of the Papacy. And this is what Creighton says:

> "If we would understand aright the force of the feelings that made the Papacy hateful, till the hatred broke out into open revolt, it is worth while to gather a few of the impassioned utterances of this time. Dietrich Vrie, a German monk who went to Constance, in a Latin poem more remarkable for its vigor than its grace, puts the following language into the mouth of the disconsolate Church:
>
> "'The Pope, once the wonder of the world, has fallen, and with him fell the heavenly temples, *my* members. Now is the reign of Simon Magus, and the riches of this world prevent just judgment. The Papal Court nourishes every kind of scandal. . . . . the rich is honoured, the poor is despised . . . . the Pope himself, head of all wickedness, plots every kind of disgraceful scheme.' Several pages of material written at the time, to this same effect. Thus fell John XXIII., undefended and, it would seem, unpitied; nor has posterity reversed the verdict of the Council."[21]

Duchesne's frank and forceful characterizations are:

> Of Pope Sergius II.: "Weak-minded, passionate, foul-mouthed, and gouty" . . . . "to his brother Benedict, a rustic boor of vicious habits, the Pope gave the Bishopric of Albano."
>
> "Pope Sergius III. was on terms of intimacy with

---

[18] Duchesne: *The Beginnings*, etc., pp. 200, 202, 249, 250, and 275.
[19] Acton: *Historical Essays and Studies*, 1907, pp. 67 and 77, 78.
[20] Same, p. 503-506.
[21] Creighton: *A History of the Papacy During the Period of the Reformation*. By M. Creighton, M.A., late Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. 1882 and 1904, Vol. I, pp. 261, 262, and 299, and foll. *cf.* pp. 68, 82, 268.

Marozia, one of Theodora's daughters, and he even had a son by her, who, later on, rose to the Papacy as John XI. There seems to have been no secret as to his paternity . . . . From this we see how openly vice was tolerated among the most exalted personages at that time. Pope Sergius was spiteful, brutal, and a scoundrel." [22] (Marozia was about nineteen years of age when Sergius died at the age of forty-seven).

Of Pope John XII.: "His days and nights were spent in the society of women and young men, and in the midst of the pleasures of the table and the chase. His illicit amours were a matter of public knowledge, for they were restrained neither by ties of blood nor by respect of persons. The Lateran became a resort of persons of ill-fame; and no virtuous woman could remain in safety in Rome. . . . Cruelty and impiety were conspicuous, and it is said that in the Lateran festival the pope even went as far as to drink to the health of the devil!" His last hours are too scandalous to record here.

Duchesne

"Indeed, even if we eliminate the gross scandals which are on record, it must be admitted that the personal character of almost all the Popes of those days was far removed indeed from the apostolic ideal."

"Iniquitous proceedings had disgraced the pontificate of Stephen III." [23]

Now those citations are not at all a turning aside from the proper sphere of our subject. But they are essential to show how the bad discipline and bad example of the Papacy was being reflected upon the world at large at a time when its influence was the strongest. They show the Roman Church can lose ideals, and may become powerless for moral purposes. They show why people turned to Popes to get divorces, and how reasonable were the expectations of most accommodating treatment. Centuries of precedent, not to mention contemporary events, and cases in his own family, convinced Henry VIII. that the Papacy was no guardian of family virtue; that from it he could obtain license for whatever he wished. We may not for a moment reasonably attribute to Wolsey or to the Pope, indignation against Henry of a moral kind.

---

[22] Duchesne: *Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes*, pp. 138, 140, and 209, with note.

[23] The same, pp. 223, 232, 271, and Chapter VII.

Cardinal Gibbons as a Historian.

It is necessary to quote the passages above, because Cardinal Gibbons is quite ingenious and diligent in spreading impressions favorable to the accused Papacy, and quite blind to the character of papal action against Henry.

On account of the wide circulation of Cardinal Gibbons' writings, it will be necessary to show in this section with unmistakable clearness just what kind of a writer he is in matters historical. I will select the following heads as typical, not claiming the collection is complete, and resting pretty well satisfied that a thorough search of the Cardinal's writings, such as I have not made, would reveal at least as many more cases where his wealth of readers and their willing partiality have been unto him an occasion of falling: The Character of Popes, The Character of the Church, The Early Character of Henry, The Early Character of John Boyle O'Reilly, The Massacre of St. Bartholomew, The Colony of Maryland, The Royal Supremacy, and other errors, his disuse and misuse of authorities, and the better attitude prevailing amongst others in his own Church.

1. He argues that the Roman "Catholic Church alone has been the consistent and uncompromising vindicator of the principles of Christian wedlock."[24]

He says that the Roman Church "Excommunicated Henry VIII. because he persisted in violating the sacred law of marriage."[25]

And: "Pope Clement VII. sternly refused the separation" of Henry VIII. from Catherine.[26]

The use of such a word as stern is quite ideal.

And: "The avowed enemies of the Church charge only five or six Popes with immorality. Thus, even admitting the truth of the accusations brought against them, we have forty-three virtuous to one bad Pope." He then accuses the "avowed enemies of the Church" of "ignorance, malice, flagrant

The Papacy and Christian Marriage

[24] Gibbons: *The Ambassador of Christ*, 1896, p. 337.
[25] Gibbons: *The Faith of Our Fathers*, 47th carefully revised and enlarged edition, 1895, p. 28.
[26] The same, p. 472.

perversions of truth."[27] This is simply withholding admission where, in the end, admission must be made.

The sufficient answer is found in the Roman Catholics Acton and Duchesne. If Cardinal Gibbons could pretend to know history as they do, we might rejoice at the vast circulation of his books. But for his authorities on the English Reformation he gives only Macaulay and D'Aubigné.[28] Acton and Duchesne, as we have shown, disagree with Cardinal Gibbons in their estimates of the characters of Popes; and with them the *Catholic Encyclopedia* says that Alexander VI. "never found an apologist."[29]

2. When Cardinal Gibbons speaks of Luther's "murderous reform,"[30] he so far idealizes the Roman Church as to absolve it from all responsibility for confusion and disunity. Not so, however, the most recent of Roman Catholic authorities; which admits the "abuses in the Church" in 1522, when Campeggio submitted "one of the best and most thorough-going" of the "plans for" their "reform." "He boldly declared that the chief source of all the evils was the Roman Curia." He styled officials of the Dataria "bloodsuckers." "He spoke strongly against the reckless granting of indulgences, especially against those of the Franciscans, and those connected with the contributions towards the building of St. Peter's at Rome." Recalling "the invertebrate tendency of mind which thinks it is impartial merely because it is undecided, and regards the judicial attitude as that which refrains from judging,"[31] it is admitted that Campeggio heard the plea for annulment of Henry's marriage with delay, without decision, and "on the last day, when everyone expected the final decision, he boldly adjourned the court."[32] One wonders just why such action, or inaction, is to be conceived as bold.

Need of Reformation

---

[27] The same, p. 147.

[28] For which see forward, p. 100.

[29] Gibbons: *The Faith*, etc., pp. 66 and 68.

[30] Gibbons in O'Donovan: "Assertio Septem Sacramentorum . . . by Henry VIII., King," etc., 1908, p. 11.

[31] Acton: *History of Freedom*, etc., Introduction, p. 34.

[32] *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. III. p. 223.

3. Equally untrue is Cardinal Gibbons' description of Henry VIII.—as "truly Catholic."[33] The publishers' circular going with this, says: "Father O'Donovan . . . . shows us Henry VIII. in the days when he was a Catholic beau-ideal, ... a faithful son of the Church." These papers have been widely distributed throughout the country.

But the book of Henry VIII. which the Cardinal, the priest, and the publisher so cordially commend, was written (1522) at the very time when Henry was an adulterer and a murderer. Some form of jealousy of the Duke of Buckingham tempts Henry to his murder in 1521. Henry's illegitimate child was born of Elizabeth Blunt in 1519. His sin begins in 1514. He was married in 1509. From the age of 23 up, the man who elicits praise from Cardinal Gibbons is involved in a career[34] of self-will and rebellion against the moral teaching of Christ and the Apostles which was known to Henry and his court as clearly as it is known to us to-day.[35] This is the "truly Catholic" character whom Cardinal Gibbons holds up to our admiration. To say the least, men might be more fortunate in the selection of a "beau-ideal" to present to the public. All this virtuous Catholic faithfulness Henry loses when he "became the first head of the Protestant Church in England." [36] Then he is a roué, Protestant.

Character of Henry VIII.

4. In 1902, an eminent Irishman administered a sharp

---

[33] Gibbons in O'Donovan: As before, p. 11. How much value to "orthodox" doctrine from a life already stained with deadly sin? *Cf.* press dispatch, Dec. 20, 1909: "The Belgian Episcopate to-day issued a pastoral letter, eulogizing King Leopold as . . . the glorifier of the Catholic faith."

[34] Brewer: *The Reign of Henry VIII,* Vol. II, p. 104.

[35] Acton: *Historical Essays and Studies,* pp. 504-506, as follows:

"The inflexible integrity of the moral code is, to me, the secret of the authority, the dignity, the utility of History."

"The moral code, in its main lines, is not new, it has long been known, it is not universally accepted in Europe even now; the difference in moral insight between past and present is not very large."

"In Christendom time and place do not excuse—if the Apostles' code sufficed for salvation."

"There is little of [progress in ethics] between St. John and the Victorian era." See also *Lord Acton's Letters,* etc., p. 83.

[36] O'Donovan, as before, pp. 11, 15. The beau-ideal and roué passage is O'Donovan's.

rebuke to Cardinal Gibbons for trifling with historical matters of which he was ignorant. In the course of a discussion of moral questions, concerned chiefly with speaking the truth, with military oaths and their violation, with "moral compromise," loyalty, fidelity, honor, the historian Lecky said:

> "Many of my readers will remember an exquisite little poem called 'The Forced Recruit,' in which Mrs. Browning has described a young Venetian soldier who was forced by the conscription to serve against his fellow-countrymen in the Austrian army at Solferino, and who advanced cheerfully to die by the Italian guns, holding a musket that had never been loaded in his hand. Such a figure, such a violation of military law, will claim the sympathy of all, but a very different judgment should be passed upon those who, having voluntarily entered an army, betray their trust and their oath in the name of patriotism. In the Fenian movement in Ireland, one of the chief objects of the conspirators was to corrupt the Irish soldiers and break down the high sense of military honor for which in all times and in many armies the Irish people have been conspicuous. 'The epidemic' [of disaffection], boasts a writer who was much mixed in the conspiracies of those times, 'was not an affair of individuals, but of companies and of whole regiments. To attempt to impeach all the military Fenians before courts martial would have been to throw England into a panic, if not to precipitate an appalling mutiny and invite foreign invasion.'[87]
>
> "I do not quote these words as a true statement. They are, I believe, a gross exaggeration and a gross calumny on the Irish soldiers, nor do I doubt but that most, if not all, the soldiers who may have been induced over a glass of whiskey, or through the persuasions of some cunning agitator, to take the Fenian oath would, if an actual conflict had arisen, have proved perfectly faithful soldiers of the Queen. The perversion of morals, however, which looks on such violations of military duty as praiseworthy, has not been confined to writers of the stamp of Mr. O'Brien. A striking instance of it is furnished by a recent American biography. Among the early Fenian conspirators was a young man named John Boyle O'Reilly. He was a genuine enthusiast, with a real vein of literary talent; in the closing years of his life he won the affection and admiration of very

Lecky on Cardinal Gibbons' History

[87] *Contemporary Review*, May, 1897. Article By William O'Brien, "Was Fenianism ever Formidable?" Ref. as given by Lecky.

honourable men, and I should certainly have no wish to look harshly on youthful errors which were the result of a misguided enthusiasm if they had been acknowledged as such. As a matter of fact, however, he began his career by an act which, according to every sound principle of morality, religion, and secular honor, was in the highest degree culpable. Being a sworn Fenian, he entered a regiment of hussars, assumed the uniform of the Queen, and took the oath of allegiance for the express purpose of betraying his trust and seducing the soldiers of his regiment. He was detected and condemned to penal servitude, and he at last escaped to America, where he took an active part in the Fenian movement. After his death his biography was written in a strain of unqualified eulogy, but the biographer has honestly and fully disclosed the facts which I have related. This book has an introduction written by Cardinal Gibbons, one of the most prominent Catholic divines in the United States. The reader may be curious to see how the act of aggravated treachery and perjury which it revealed was judged by a personage who occupies all but the highest position in a Church which professes to be the supreme and inspired teacher of morals. Not a word in this introduction implies that O'Reilly had done any act for which he should be ashamed. He is described as 'a great and good man,' and the only allusion to his crime is in the following terms: 'In youth his heart agonises over that saddest and strangest romance in all history—the wrongs and woes of his motherland—that Niobe of the Nations. In manhood, because he dared to wish her free, he finds himself a doomed felon, an exiled convict, in what he calls himself the Nether World . . . . The Divine faith implanted in his soul in childhood flourished there undyingly, pervaded his whole being with its blessed influences, furnished his noblest ideals of thought and conduct . . . . The country of his adoption vies with the land of his birth in testifying to the uprightness of his life. . . . . With all these voices I blend my own, and in their name I say that the world is brighter for having possessed him.'" [38]

[38] Roche's *Life of John Boyle O'Reilly*, with introduction by Cardinal Gibbons. Since the publication of this book Cardinal Gibbons has written a letter to the *Tablet* (December 2, 1899), in which he says: "I feel it due to myself and the interests of truth to declare that till I read Mr. Lecky's criticism I did not know that Mr. O'Reilly had ever been a Fenian or a British soldier, or that he had tried to seduce other soldiers from their allegiance. In fact, up to this moment, I have never read a line of the biography for which I wrote the introduction. . . . . My only acquaintance with Mr. O'Reilly's history before he came to America was the vague information I had that, for some political offence, the exact nature of which

5. Compare the judgment of Acton with that of Cardinal Gibbons on this event:

"What about the massacre of St. Bartholomew? The Church had no act or part in this atrocious butchery, except to deplore the event and weep over its unhappy victims."[39]

But Acton says:

> "that it was a premeditated crime; that Mariana witnessed the carnage, and imagined that it must gladden every Catholic heart." "One fervent enthusiast praised God for the heavenly news, and also St. Bartholomew for having lent his extremely penetrating knife for the salutary sacrifice. A month after the event the renowned preacher Panigarola delivered from the pulpit a panegyric on the monarch who had achieved what none had ever heard or read before, by banishing heresy in a single day, and by a single word, from the land of France." . . . . "The French Churches . . . . rang with canticles of unholy joy." The most grievous sorrow of the king on his deathbed, reported by his confessor, "was that he left the work unfinished. In all that blood-stained history there is nothing more tragic than the scene in which the last words preparing the soul for judgment were spoken by such a confessor as Sorbin to such a penitent as Charles."
>
> "The Jesuit who wrote his life by desire of his son, says that Gregory thanked God in private, but that in public he gave signs of a tempered joy. But the illuminations and processions, the singing of *Te Deum* and the firing of the castle guns, the jubilee, the medal, and the paintings whose faded colors still vividly preserve to our age the passions of that day, nearly exhausted the modes by which a Pope could manifest

Massacre of St. Bartholomew

I did not learn, he had been exiled from his native land to a penal colony, from which he afterwards escaped."

"I gladly accept this assurance of Cardinal Gibbons, though I am surprised that he should not have even glanced at the book which he introduced, and that he should have been absolutely ignorant of the most conspicuous event of the life which, from early youth, he held up to unqualified admiration. I regret, too, that he has not taken the opportunity of this letter to reprobate a form of moral perversion which is widely spread among his Irish co-religionists, and which his own words are only too likely to strengthen. It is but a short time since an Irish Nationalist member of Parliament, being accused of once having served the Queen as a volunteer, justified himself by saying that he had only worn the coat which was worn by Lord Edward Fitzgerald and Boyle O'Reilly; while another Irish Nationalist member of Parliament, at a public meeting in Dublin, and amid the cheers of his audience, expressed his hope that in the South African war the Irish soldiers under the British flag would fire on the English instead of on the Boers."—LECKY: *The Map of Life*, 1902, pp. 104-107.

[39] Gibbons: *The Faith of Our Fathers*, pp. 296 and 297.

> delight." The story follows of "the welcome intelligence," its receipt by the Pope, the reward he gives, and how the Pope with assembled Cardinals went to the nearest church to praise God. Gregory and his secretary did not believe the falsehood that the Huguenots had a plot against the king. It was a "hollow pretence." The Papal Legate to France said the massacre was "an extraordinary grace vouchsafed to Christendom." [40]

In face of this, which has been told over and over again before Acton, though never so eloquently, Cardinal Gibbons can say:

"No author . . . . has ever, to my knowledge, accused them of any complicity in the heinous massacre."

It is time for teachers to be perfectly fair to the facts of the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and to set aside the exaggerations which recur in many sketches intended to be introductory to the Reformation. I have seen statements that 100,000 were massacred, and down to 50,000 and 25,000; and I am sure there is no one who is merely human who would not prefer to accept Lord Acton's estimate:

"There is no evidence to make it probable that more than seven thousand victims perished." [41]

On the general subject of persecution, there are these interesting statements:

> Pope Pius V. "seriously contemplated razing the town of Faenza because it was infested with religious error," and required a massacre of the French Huguenots; "he sanctioned the murder of Elizabeth." [42]

---

[40] Acton: *The History of Freedom,* etc., pp. 124, 125, 126, 127, 132-136. Mariana was a historian, and was 35 years old at the time of the massacre.

[41] Same, p. 106. Compare "All account of it must be omitted," a Roman Catholic critic's orders to the publishers of a certain book of history—a public school text book. My information comes from the author, who, on account of this circumstance and similar alterations in her work, refused to allow her name to be attached to it.

[42] Same, pp. 138 and 139. And *Lord Acton's Letters,* etc., 1904, pp. 61 and 45. Prof. Bigg (Oxford Univ.) supports the charge of papal sanction to assassinate Queen Elizabeth, *Wayside Sketches,* 1906, p. 206. MacColl: *Reformation Settlement,* 10th ed., 1901, gives the letters (pp. 82-94) from *Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen,* pp. xlvi-xlviii, edited by the Fathers of the Congregation of the London Oratory, with an Historical Introduction by Thomas Francis Knox, D.D. Father Knox defends the plot. This Roman Catholic authority shows the Pope or his Curia (probably the Pope) offering 20,000 *scudi* for Elizabeth's murder, and to be one of four to raise 80,000 *scudi.* This would go far to justify all Elizabeth's policies and suspicions. When, after this acknowledgment (MacColl, p. 518) and an interval of 336 years, the Pope again expresses his opinion of the English Church, there is not a word of regret for the faults on the papal side which had so large a

> "Guyon, whose history of Orleans is pronounced by the censors full of sound doctrine and pious sentiment, deems it unworthy of Catholics to speak of the murder of heretics as if it were a crime, because, when done under lawful authority, it is a blessed thing."
>
> "The last downright apologists" for the massacre were a "German Jesuit" and a "Papal historian," "just a century ago." "Then there was a change. A time came when the Catholics, having long relied on force, were compelled to appeal to opinion. That which had been defiantly acknowledged and defended required to be ingeniously explained away. The same motive which had justified the murder now prompted the lie. Men shrank from the conviction that the rulers and restorers of this Church had been murderers and abetters of murder. . . . A swarm of facts was invented to meet the difficulty. The victims were insignificant in number; they were slain for no reason connected with religion; the Pope believed in the existence of the plot; the plot was a reality; the medal is fictitious; the Pope rejoiced only when he heard that it was over. These things were repeated so often that they have been sometimes believed." [43]

Thus Acton sharply contradicts Cardinal Gibbons. The latter unfortunately cites Ranke as his authority. And Ranke *is* an authority. Stubbs says:

> "Leopold von Ranke is not only beyond all comparison the greatest historical scholar alive, but one of the greatest historians that ever lived." [44]

Acton's opinion of Ranke is that he "attained a position unparalleled."[45] Here, then, we have Lord Acton and Cardinal Gibbons, both Roman Catholic writers, disagreeing in the matter of Papal responsibility for the massacre of St. Bartholomew, but deferring to the same authority. Here, then, in Ranke, we should have found a court of arbitration. And we discover that Ranke stands with Acton and not with

---

part in sundering the Italian from the English Christians. One would naturally expect any advantageous reopening of the correspondence to be attended by a frank and christianly expression of regret for so grievous and foul a cause of disunion. Prof. Terry of the Univ. of Chicago, says *Letters and Memorials* is not so well known as it should be. I know many libraries where there is no copy; for instance, neither of the big public libraries of Buffalo. Dr. Gee says: "There is no reason to doubt the revelation that they make."

[43] Same, pp. 147-149.
[44] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures,* p. 65.
[45] Acton: *Historical Essays,* etc., p. 352.

Cardinal Gibbons; that Cardinal Gibbons' reference is not sustained by his chosen authority in the sense that he made it. For Ranke shows that in 1530 Cardinal Campeggio wrote the Emperor to prosecute, rob, and even to kill the Reformers. Ranke says Pope Pius V. gave order to kill the Huguenots. Yet, specifically,

> "it cannot be proved that he was privy to the preparations for the massacre of St. Bartholomew; but he did things that make it evident he would have approved of it as much as his successor." "Pope Gregory XIII. celebrated this great event by a solemn procession to the Church of San Luigi." "Cardinal Santorio Sanseverina, . . . in his autobiography, designates the Parisian massacre as 'the celebrated day of St. Bartholomew, most cheering to the Catholics.'" [46]

6. In 1908, in a sermon in London, Cardinal Gibbons said:

"Catholic Maryland gave freedom and hospitality to Puritans and Episcopalians alike." And: "This colony of British Catholics was the first to establish on American soil the blessings of civil and religious liberty." In reply to this, the Rev. Dr. Randolph H. McKim of Washington, by birth "a Marylander and the son of a Marylander," says:

Who Gave Toleration in Maryland?

> "Lord Baltimore's colony . . . . was composed in very large part of Protestants . . . . were not Protestants in a considerable majority? . . . . toleration was primarily a measure of self-defence . . . the Edict of Toleration was passed by a Legislature two-thirds of whose members appear to have been Protestants; 16 Protestants and 8 Roman Catholics. The Governor himself at the time was a Protestant. . . . . the charter granted Lord Baltimore . . . . required that the religion of the English Church should be recognized." . . . . Spain, France, and Italy were not giving toleration at the time; Queen Mary did not give toleration. Toleration in Maryland is "clearly traceable to the mixed character of the colony, and to the necessity of the situation—colonists of whatever religion being necessary to the growth of the colony."

7. Cardinal Gibbons says: "The Church of England

---

[46] Ranke: *History of the Popes,* 1871, pp. 98, 99, Ed. of 1844, Bk. 3 at end, p. 122; Bk. 5, p. 181; Pt. 2, Bk. 6, pp. 227 and 228.

[47] *New York Sun.* 7 Oct. 1908.

acknowledges the reigning Sovereign as its Spiritual Head."[48] It does not.

Head of the Church

The royal supremacy is a matter into which we cannot go in this paper, as it is a legal matter of comparatively small interest to Americans. But it may as well be said here that it does not mean all that it is often said to mean in the school-room. We cannot do better than indicate the lines within which the royal supremacy runs:

> "The doctrine of the Queen's (the Royal) supremacy . . . . does not mean that the King or the Queen assumes to be able to arbitrate or assumes to settle what is the faith of the Church of Christ, but simply that the Queen is the head of all things in all causes ecclesiastical and civil within these realms; and that it is her duty to see that all her subjects, ecclesiastical and civil, have justice done to them. That is the meaning of the supremacy."[49]

And:

"The title of 'Head of the Church' has never been borne by any English sovereign since the accession of Elizabeth."[50]

And another says:

> "The Papal Supremacy was abolished, so we were told, and the Royal Supremacy was set up in its stead. The statement is simply untrue. The Royal Supremacy has existed ever since there was a King of England; he has always been supreme over all his subjects, clergy and laity, and all their concerns, just as any other king has. . . . . It is true that it was reasserted at the Reformation, and true also that the Crown resumed the exercise of certain rights which hitherto, with its permission or at least tacit sanction, the Papacy had exercised. It is true also that for a time things went even beyond this; Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Queen Mary made use of a novel title, *Supreme Head,* and interfered in ecclesiastical affairs in a way hitherto unheard of. This, however, ceased after the first year of Mary's reign, and *was never afterwards revived.*"[51]

The famous authority on law, Blackstone, says the nomi-

---

[48] Gibbons: *The Faith of Our Fathers,* 1895, p. 47.
[49] Dr. Jacob, now Bishop of St. Albans, 1893.
[50] MacColl: *The Reformation Settlement,* p. 108.
[51] Collins: *The Reformation and Its Consequences,* p. 41. See Wakeman: *The Royal Supremacy in England,* 1897, or his *History,* pp. 315-324.

nation to Bishoprics was an ancient prerogative of the crown.[52]

> "The power claimed by Henry VIII. under the title Head of the Church, was fourfold. It included, in the *first* place, the King's ecclesiastical prerogative, which, as we have seen, had always been maintained by English law, and, *secondly,* the Papal usurpations from the Crown by provisions, appeals, and annates. These were recovered by two statutes. . . . . *Thirdly,* the King claimed the power usurped by the Papacy from the Church of England. This was recovered and added to the Crown by three statutes. . . . . A *fourth* set of powers included in the royal supremacy was made up of claims which the king had never hitherto put forward. . . . . As the King, although in theory present in all the courts, has no right to take the place of a secular judge and administer justice, so in ecclesiastical matters he has no right to supersede an officer or to issue orders at his own pleasure." [53]

8. I will close this section by noting a few more errors by Gibbons. He says: "The Anglican or Episcopal Church owes its origin to Henry VIII." "The Episcopalian denomination was founded by Henry VIII. in 1534."[54] This is a position which scarcely any historians have ever taken, and the difficulty of supporting it has led some later Roman writers to abandon it and substitute Elizabeth or Edward VI. Five times on one page the term divorce is used for Henry's suit, though it is known to all that it was not a suit for divorce, but a tangle over Rome's right to forbid certain marriages and Rome's further right to dispense with its own prohibitions. With both points dubious, the tangle is certain.

His defense of Queen Mary's persecutions is a very curious one, in place of a frank acknowledgment of wrong and error.[55]

Cardinal Gibbons says: "Our Saviour instituted . . . .

---

[52] Blackstone: *Commentaries,* 4, p. 107.

[53] Medley: *A Student's Manual of English Constitutional History,* by Dudley Julius Medley, M.A., Oxford, 1894, pp. 545 and 546. Chapter XI. of this book is unexcelled in its mode of treating the growth of papal influence and the repetition of resistance to it. Papal growth is by five ways of interference: in appointments, encouraging appeals, by legates, and financially by provisions and reservations, and by exactions of money. He speaks of the "Church of England before and after the Reformation" as evidently the same, p. 527.

[54] Gibbons: *Faith of Our Fathers,* pp. 66 and 68.

[55] The same, p. 301.

extreme unction and matrimony." [56] This is a startling use of the New Testament.

He speaks of marriage in a light way degrading to women, with the usual purpose of arrogating superior sanctity to the Roman priesthood, and those who think marriage best he calls uxorious.[57]

The worst and most inexcusable of the Cardinal's errors is the root and fount of them all. It is his neglect of authorities; disuse and misuse. We have shown already how he names for authorities Macaulay and D'Aubigné. We have given a chapter to show what slight reason there is now to trust "the magnificent ruin known as Macaulay's *History of England.*"[58] And of D'Aubigné, perhaps Cardinal Gibbons' readers will allow us to insert the following:

> "The story is told that on one occasion the Swiss diplomat, Merle d'Aubigné (1794-1872) the author of a *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century,* met Leopold von Ranke, and claimed acquaintance with him as a brother historian. The author of the *History of the Popes* demurred a little, and then replied that d'Aubigné wrote as a Protestant first and a historian afterwards, whereas in his own works he endeavoured to be the historian first of all. Setting on one side the greatness of the one and the mediocrity of the other, it would not be easy to give a better illustration of the difference between them. D'Aubigné's work is of course long dead; but even in its own day, and even from the point of view of the most militant Protestantism, it was immeasurably inferior in value to von Ranke's work, simply because the one is true history and the other is the evil thing which is sometimes spoken of as 'history with a purpose.'" [59]

The main fault of Cardinal Gibbons in his efforts to teach or explain history is his utter recklessness and ignor-

---

[56] The same, p. 304.

[57] The same, pp. 461-463. The latest historical traps into which Cardinal Gibbons has fallen may be found in the *North American,* 1909, March, p. 321; May, p. 662; July, p. 34, and Sabatier: *An Open Letter to Cardinal Gibbons,* 1908, pp. 35 and 53: "A plain Frenchman, who loves his small country, France, and our large country, the Church, I feel myself forced to tell you how deplorable are your grave and solemn words, since they are calculated to create in those who depend solely upon them entirely wrong ideas about that which goes on among us at this moment."

[58] Hannis Taylor, LL.D.: *The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution,* 1898, Preface, p. vi.

[59] Collins: *The Study of Ecclesiastical History,* 1903, p. 13; and Acton: *Lectures on Modern History,* pp. 19 and 333.

ance in the use of authorities. The extent of the evil done in this way is not easy to calculate. Possibly few books since Macaulay have been more widely circulated than the works of Cardinal Gibbons. Everywhere they are the food and joy of the Roman Catholic population. Already carrying the fading remnant of racial feeling due to injustice at the hands of Britain, these people are still somewhat ready to listen to a story alleging injustice to their religion. They quite believe the Churches were stolen from them. The feeling engendered lives as a fire in the brush, blazing up as hard-feeling against certain others. Cardinal Gibbons' historical writings have spread and kept alive opinions which are the basis of these antagonisms. Put forth as charity for unfortunate and ignorant separatists, these opinions have gone far into the Roman population of this country and have fostered a feeling antagonistic to friendly relations, to social relations, and often to any relations of any kind between the Churches, as well as an inexcusable contempt for the facts of history as they are. How this works and travels is well illustrated by this incident:

Effects of Bad Historical Writing

In the early summer of 1908, a learned and reverend professor in one of our American institutions took his place in the nave of Westminster Abbey. Awaiting the opening of a great service, his thoughts travelled along through the centuries as generation after generation of Christians seemed to be joining with him in worship. The political conditions of these Christian generations varied as much as perhaps it would be possible for human conditions to vary; but it was the one God that brought them into His Presence. Touched by thoughts of the past; inspired by the solemn majesty of arch and curve and carving conceived in the highest inspiration, planned with the most delicate fancy, executed with the perfection of human skill to the glory of God and of His Christ—in the midst of a reverie half memory and half worship, he heard a voice from behind him, saying:

"Just think, Pat, they used to have Mass here. Those blackguards stole the whole thing."

I will conclude this section by giving an example of the more liberal treatment of other Churches than their own by a French Roman Catholic layman, which is a type of the way the real historians of the Roman Church have already begun to think; and this spirit already prevails over a large section of the Roman Catholic clergy. We may readily suppose that in due time this is the spirit which will prevail in the Roman Church and will lead up to adjustments, making a material change in feelings and relations of the old Churches.

A French Roman Catholic writer says:

> "You will anticipate that with their respect for ancient ceremonies the Russians take no notice of *services of recent institution, such as our Benediction.* [The benediction with the Blessed Sacrament, often an afternoon service.] All their devotion is concentrated on the Canonical office. The Mass—*called the Liturgy*—is the centre of it . . . . What adds to its grandeur is that there are never low Masses . . . . Everything is sung . . . . No celibate is admitted to the cure (care) of souls . . . . Half a century ago the priests never preached: now they preach every week. . . . and eloquence with the Russians takes the place of authority, so that one dreams of the incalculable power of these rare pulpit orators . . . . The largest churches . . . . are filled to overflowing on feast days . . . . Russian religion exactly suits Russian society . . . . The Russian Church . . . . has no infection of Protestantism . . . . Protestantism . . . . has two characteristics: intellectual arrogance, which isolates itself in freedom of thought; a craving for novelties, which breaks away from tradition . . . . There could not be a worse soil for Protestantism than communal and conservative Russia. The Russian is communal; for him all morality can be deduced from love of the neighbor, and all worship is, to start with, association . . . . it is impossible to Romanize a *Moujik* by himself, for among these Orientals religion is not an individual affair . . . . Christians should have other ambitions than to fish for single souls in their neighbor's pond, when they could make in the open sea of heathendom so beautiful a miraculous draught . . . . Keep Russian orthodoxy on Slav soil; keep Roman Catholicism on Latin ground . . . The national

religion is absolutely suited to the national character . . . . To try and ruin the Orthodox Church is to play the game of atheism." [60]

Lord Acton.

Lord Acton thus explodes the whole line of theories for the purity of the Papacy and its agents, and their alliance with the cause of right alone, as Cardinal Gibbons idealizes it:

"It was not unreasonable to apprehend that Henry, who had been unfaithful to the Queen in earlier years, would not be true to her now . . . . Henry could expect that nothing would be denied to him that favor or influence could procure for others." [61]

On the Reformation

Wolsey writes in favor of the divorce; the Pope is influenced, not by a desire to protect the family, but only by political considerations. Catharine sees in Wolsey the advocate of the divorce. It was Wolsey's scheme to detach from Rome both the Gallican and Anglican Churches. "More promised to read nothing that was written in favor of the Queen, and consented to act ministerially against her; assured the house that the opinions of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge alone were enough to settle the question. Whilst he remained in power he left the Queen to her fate." "Fisher was the one writer among our countrymen who had crudely avowed the conviction that there is no remedy for religious error but fire and steel; and the sanction of his fame was already given to the bloody statute and to a century of persecution and suffering more cruel than his own." Compare: "Luther strenuously upheld the rights of Catharine." The Pope gave Henry all he wished in the Secret Bull. Cardinal Campeggio appears as the minister of the divorce. Three Popes offered to acknowledge the title of Elizabeth if she would become Roman in secret. Wolsey favors a scheme to get Henry and the Queen to take monastic vows, with intent prepense to have Henry break the same; tries to get a document falsely pronounced as forgery. Clement, the Pope, puts his political expediency in advance of the rights of Catharine. "The idea that the divorce was instigated by divines of Anne Boleyn's faction was put forward by *Pole,* apparently with a view to connect Cranmer and

[60] Davey Biggs: *Russia and Reunion,* A Translation of Wilbol's *L'Avenir de l'Eglise Russe,* by the Rev. C. R. Davey Biggs, D.D., vicar of St. Philip and St. James', Oxford (England). Mowbray, 1908, pp. 113, 167, 226, 228.

[61] Acton: *Historical Essays and Studies,* p. 10.

the Lutheran influence with the beginning of the troubles." Acton says Wolsey was the author of the divorce. If the English Roman Catholics have any bias, it would naturally be to represent the Reformation in England as springing from an unclean passion. Pole, who was a great authority amongst them, had given the example of this controversial use of Anne Boleyn. Acton commends Mr. Brewer's "dignified liberality, ceremonious self-restraint, from an illustrious scholar who is willing to think nobly of the Church of Rome, towards a prelate by whose fault that Church was dishonoured and cast down" . . . . calls Wolsey as "a minister of tyranny, as a pensioner of foreign potentates, as a priest of immoral life." "The Cardinal attempted to obtain from Parliament a declaration that all things in the land belonged to the Crown" . . . . takes a bribe of over a million dollars from France. Lord Acton says Wolsey had a son and a daughter illegitimate, that herein his conduct undermined the Roman Church and inclined men to the Reformation, and calls up "that appalling vision of the dying prelate, who, having made his peace with God, gathered his last breath to fan the flames of Smithfield." [62]

Of his experience in historical investigation, Acton

On the Study of History

"more than once relates how in early life he had sought guidance in the difficult historical questions which beset the history of the Papacy from many of the most eminent ultramontanes. Later he was able to test their answers in the light of his constant study of original authorities and his careful investigation of archives. He found that the answers given him had been at the best but plausible evasions . . . . that bitter feeling which arises in any reflecting mind on the discovery that it has been put off with explanations that did not explain, or left in ignorance of material facts." [63]

Not only was it difficult to find the truth, but when at last it was found, there was something wholly wrong in telling it out. Acton had to face "the attempt of the famous Cardinal [Manning], in whose mind history was identified

[62] Acton: *Historical Essays and Studies,* by John E. E. Dalberg-Acton, First Baron Acton, Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 1907. pp. 11, 13, 42, 77, 19, 20, 30, 31, 35, 43, 45, 46, 49, 52, 53, 56, 57, 59, 61, and 62.

[63] Acton: *The History of Freedom and Other Essays,* with Introduction by John Neville Figgis, M.A., and Reginald Vere Laurence, M.A., both of Cambridge; 1907, p. 25.

with heresy, to drive from the Roman Communion its most illustrious layman." [Acton].[64]

> "One of the great instruments for preventing historical scrutiny had long been the index of prohibited books. Through it an effort had been made to keep the knowledge of ecclesiastical history from the faithful, and to give currency to a fabulous and fictitious picture of the progress and action of the Church." [65]

Acton was so horrified at the idea of persecution that he was quite unable to endorse any effort to make allowance for the spirit of the times. He broke with Stubbs on one point: Stubbs gives a warning not to exaggerate when speaking of religious persecutions:

> "They cannot be properly estimated without some consideration of the value set upon human life both at the period in which they occur and at other times. I am told that it could be shown that all the executions for religious causes in England, by all sides and during all time, are not so many as were the sentences of death passed in one year of the reign of George III. for one single sort of crime, the forging of bank-notes." [66]

From this and other comparisons it is clear we are making quite too much of the element of religious persecutions, that is, we are teaching it to arouse passions, all out of proportion to other circumstances quite as repulsive which we let pass. With all he has said of the participation of Popes and ecclesiastics as accessory after the fact, Lord Acton assures us the chief motive of the massacre was not, in the first place, religious.

Von Döllinger.

The greatest of Roman Catholic historians was Ignaz Von Döllinger. On several phases of the Reformation which American teachers are called upon to treat, he says:

> "On one side are ranged the whole Western Catholic Church, the whole Greek and Russian Church, and the

[64] Same, p. 13. Also Gasquet: *Lord Acton and His Circle*, 1906. p. 369 and before.

[65] Same, p. 471. The "index" grew from a local effort in Asia to protect Christians from an imposture in the name of St. Paul. How far from what it is now! Putnam: *The Censorship of the Church of Rome*, 1906, Vol. I, pp. 1, 55, 56.

[66] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures*, p. 379.

greater part of the Anglican Church; all these adhere to the ancient doctrine." [67]

"The doctrine of papal infallibility did not make its appearance in the Western Church until a very late period, and then only in consequence of a series of forgeries and inventions." [68]

On the Papacy

"Of late years Rome has had much urgent business with Spain, and of what nature was it? . . . Only very recently . . . the Pope . . . delivered an eulogy on the Inquisition, and declared it to be an excellent, beneficial, and genuine ecclesiastical institution." [69]

The Creeds of Popes Pius IV. and Pius IX. were not drawn up before the Reformation settlement in England. Von Döllinger speaks with decision:

On Infallibility

"I am now in my eighty-first year, and was a public teacher of theology for forty-seven years, during which long period no censure . . . . has ever reached me from ecclesiastical dignitaries either at home or abroad. I had *never* taught the new Articles of Faith advanced by Pius IX. and his Council. In my youth they were regarded as theological opinions, and many added 'ill-founded' opinions. In me, who for half a century had to occupy myself daily with this subject and the questions affecting it, the conviction became stronger and stronger that these doctrines and claims were not only biblically, traditionally, and historically unfounded and erroneous, but also that they had the most detrimental effects on the Church, the State, and society." [70]

This historian's work was thus recognized by his Bishop:

"Your own glorious past . . . has been filled with meritorious deeds on behalf of Catholic science." [71]

And for his historical writings, this Bishop exposed him to these penalties:

"In the documents sent me by the spiritual authorities, notice is given me that I am to incur all the consequences attached to the ban by the Canonical Law. Now the

---

[67] Von Döllinger: *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches*, 1872, p. 155.
[68] Von Döllinger: *Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees*, 1869-1887. Pub. 1891, p. 4.
[69] Same, p. 176.
[70] Same, p. 131.
[71] Same, p. 71.

On his Excommunication

> Canonical Law regards excommunication, not only as a sentence of death passed on the life of the soul, but it also exposes the body of him who is excommunicated to the murderous knife of any zealot. For this is declared by the decretal of Pope Urban II., which has been adopted in the General Ecclesiastical Book of Laws and Doctrines (quotation from the same). Cardinal Turrecremata, well known as the most eminent advocate of infallibility, has, in his commentary on this decision . . . explained it . . . as follows: 'If any one shall out of true zeal put a man to death who has been excommunicated, *nullam meretur poenitentiam,* he deserves no punishment.' " [72]

At the Bonn Reunion Conference in 1874, Dr. Döllinger said:

> "The result of my investigation is that I have no manner of doubt as to the validity of the episcopal succession in the English Church." [73]

Against which the Roman Catholic authority says:

> "The claim . . . that the Anglican Church is one and continuous with the ancient Catholic Church of the country, and is an integral portion of the Catholic Church of to-day" is "hopelessly untenable in the face of historical evidence." [74]

Where doctors disagree, it would be well for teachers not to try to decide.

> " 'Dr. Döllinger,' said Manning, 'I have asked to be introduced to you that I might thank you for having made me a Catholic.' 'I bowed,' said Döllinger . . . . Manning went on: 'Yes, it was you who made me a Catholic. For I was brought up in the belief that history could not be trusted in the hands of Catholic writers, and my own reading, I am bound to say, confirmed that impression. A book of yours fell into my hands. I read it and found that you always gave the facts truly. . . . . I saw that one might be a Catholic and yet be true to the facts of history.'

---

[72] Same, p. 143. The Jesuit Father Tyrrell was also excommunicated. He held views antagonistic to Vaticanism and Ultramontanism, as Döllinger and Acton, and not far from Duchesne. Tyrrell called Döllinger the "victim of an intolerant ecclesiastical faction, the most learned, the most loyal Roman Catholic of the last century; one who elected to suffer the extremest injury that human malice could inflict."—*Medievalism,* A Reply to Cardinal Mercier, 1908, p. 88.

[73] Gore: *Roman Catholic Claims,* 10th ed., 1906, p. 148. On his method of investigation see above, p. 51.

[74] *Catholic Encyclopedia,* 1908, Vol. I., p. 504.

'And this man,' added Döllinger, with one of his humorous smiles, 'who thanked me for having made him a Catholic through my loyalty to historic truth, now denounces me because I will not accept as an article of faith what I know to be an historic falsehood.' " [75]

The antithesis of Dr. Döllinger was Bishop Hefele, likewise a Roman Catholic historian of great distinction.

"On 10th August, 1870, he had sent Döllinger a letter, in which he declared that he would never submit to the new dogma without some modifications to which the majority at the Council had been unwilling to agree, and that he would deny the validity and liberty of the Council, even if the Romans should suspend and excommunicate him and set an administrator over his diocese. On 14th September he wrote again to Döllinger, and that letter says: 'To acknowledge anything, which in itself is not true, to be divinely revealed is a thing which those may do who can; I cannot do it.'

"Bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg, the former Professor of Church History at Tübingen, was not so pliable. He declared openly that he did not believe in the Pope's infallibility, and that he had studied Church history for thirty years without finding anything which implied that the ancient Church had believed in this dogma . . . Militor . . . . remark[ed] that Rome would soon pull the heretical hide off the new Bishop of Rottenburg (p. 419). But . . . . on 11th March, 1871 . . . . Hefele tells Döllinger that he will scarcely be able to endure the position of a suspended and excommunicated Bishop."

The result was a simple surrender of his ideas as to what was true in history.[76] Notice Hefele's timid admission, checked by a groundless conjecture, and put side by side with the triumphant, free Catholicism of the Anglican:

"The fact that the summons to the first Ecumenical Synod proceeded from the Emperor Constantine the Great, cannot be disputed." However the Bishop of Rome must have been consulted on the matter. Hefele: *A History of the Christian Church,* 1871, Vol. I, p. 9. And compare Puller: *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome,* 1900, pp. 137 and fol., 477 and fol.

"One is inclined to marvel that the Papalist should venture to name Nicæa at all . . . No one invited Sylvester of Rome to decide that momentous question."—Prof. W. Bright (Oxford Univ.): *Waymarks in Church History,* 1894, pp. 218 and 219.

[75] MacColl: *The Reformation Settlement Examined in the Light of History and Law,* 8th Ed., 1900. On the character which we might expect to find in MacColl reporting of events, Rt. Hon. G. W. E. Russell says: "He is an accomplished theologian, and he is perhaps the most expert and vigorous

With the coming of the dogma of 1870 the Roman Church in fact lost the aid of her most accomplished historians, who could not cross that line with their Church and remain true to historical facts. For its own deadly sins the Papacy has been partly in ruins these four hundred years. The seven sins political of which the Roman Church stands guilty in the court of history, are these:

1. Blessing the invasion of William the Norman;
2. Annulling Magna Charta;
3. Treatment of the body as well as the work of Wyclif;
4. Precedents leading up to the appeal of Henry VIII. for separation from his queen and the seven years' delay in answering the appeal;
5. Thanksgiving for the Massacre of St. Bartholomew;
6. Blessing the Spanish Armada, preceded by the Bull of 1570, and the plot for the Queen's murder in 1583;
7. Giving America to Spain and Portugal.

The progress of the world up to to-day is due to the fact that the power of the Papacy was set aside, providentially, if not by miracle. The relative impotence of the Roman Church to-day is due to historic events which checked her will. The Armada was turned from England and the ships of Columbus from America. Philip, Prince of Spain and soon king, married Mary Tudor, who died childless. So did Francis, Dauphin of France and soon king, who married Mary Stuart.[77]

---

pamphleteer in England." His "pamplets . . . have rushed into huge circulation and swollen to the dimensions of solid treatises." Mr. Russell speaks of "his inflexible integrity," of his being "trusted alike by Lord Salisbury and by Mr. Gladstone"; of his having "conducted negotiations of great pith and moment; and has been behind the scenes of some historic performances, yet he has never made an enemy, nor betrayed a secret, nor lowered the honor of his sacred calling." (*Collections and Recollections*, 1898, p. 167.)

[76] Nielsen: *The History of the Papacy in the XIX. Century*, by Dr. Fredrick Nielsen, Bishop of Aalborg, and formerly Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Copenhagen; translated under the direction of Arthur James Mason, D.D., Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge; 1908, Vol. II., pp. 310 and 419. Abbé Gratry called the Infallibility decree "this audacity and this power of falsehood." Cardinal Newman said it was the work of "an insolent and aggressive faction." Acton called it "this insane enterprise." Gore: *R. C. Claims*, p. 183; *Letters of Lord Acton*, p. 54.

[77] Sir J. R. Seeley: *The Growth of British Policy*, 1895, pp. 49 and 50.

So in England the Roman Church proper came as an alien and without a shadow of English succession or continuity, as a new denomination. It was organized by setting up a new episcopate only sixty years ago. Pope Pius IX. (d. 1878) was the founder of the Roman Catholic succession of Bishops now in England.[78] "From that Michaelmas Day, 1850, dates the [Roman]Catholic Church in England."[79]

There are hints from the past in the devoted sons of the Roman Church as to what may yet be, what must be as the rank and file of priests and laity become more attentive to the voice of history:

> "In 1682 . . . . an assembly of the French clergy adopted the Four Articles of the Gallican Church. These asserted: 1, that the power of the Pope is wholly spiritual and that kings cannot be deposed by him; 2, that Popes are subject to the decisions of General Councils; 3, the Popes must govern according to the accepted laws of the Church, and, especially, according to the rights of the Gallican Church; and 4, that decisions of the Popes in matters of faith have only a temporary force, and to become permanently binding must be accepted by a General Council." [80]

And:

James II. based his plan of tolerance on the fact that "as the [Roman] Church did not pretend to be infallible, it would be unreasonable to force her dogmas upon his subjects."[81] The Roman Catholics of England sued for and obtained political privileges on the statement, "We acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope."[82]

---

[78] Collins: *The Reformation and Its Consequences,* p. 262. He proves this statement from the writings of Cardinals Newman, Manning, and Vaughan, and of Fathers Humphrey, S. J., and Breen, O.S.B.

[79] E. S. Purcell: *Life of Cardinal Manning,* Vol. 2, p. 773.

[80] Professor George B. Adams, Yale: *Civilization During the Middle Ages,* 1894, p. 410, and *The Cambridge Modern History,* Vol. V., pp. 74-76.

[81] A. Shield and Andrew Lang: *The King Over the Water,* 1907, p. 7.

[82] Allen: *The Protestation of 1788,* pp. 28, 29, 32, 44 (pub. 1897).

CHAPTER XI.

LUTHERAN, PRESBYTERIAN, AND CONGREGATIONAL EXPRESSIONS.

In this chapter we take up first a few typical German names.

1. Felix Makower, Barrister of Berlin: "It is frequently assumed that the present established church is identical with the pre-reformation Church of England." This the author denies. He would like to see the English Church recognize Lutheran and other ordained or unordained ministries,[1] but the ordinal of the Prayer Book is against him. His plea only proves that law and opinion in the Church of England are in favor of continuity and against the position which he takes as above.

2. Ploetz, "well known in Germany as a veteran teacher, the author of a number of educational works bearing a high reputation": "1563. Completion of the establishment of the Anglican [Church of England, Episcopal Church] Protestant dogmas, with retention of the Catholic hierarchy and partially of the cult."[2]

3. Kurtz gives little on the English movements. You get one non-committal sentence under Elizabeth: "1571 . . . brings to a close the first stage in the history of the English Reformation—the setting up by law of the Anglican State

---

[1] Makower: *Constitutional History of the Church of England.* Translated from the German, 1895, 3. 17. 1. 2, pp. 177 and 174, and following. So Häusser: *The Period of the Reformation,* 1873 (Am. Tract Society), pp. 163, 561, 566, 577.

[2] Ploetz: *Epitome of Universal History,* Translated and edited by Wm. H. Tillinghast, 2d Ed., 1884, and 8th Ed., p. 338; Introduction, p. ix.

Church with episcopal constitution, with apostolical succession under royal supremacy, as the Established Church."[3]

4. Seebohm sees the eastern limit of Papal headship. He says: "Western Christendom was united under one ecclesiastical system . . . of which Rome was the capital." But he overlooks the limit on the papal power which we find drawn by antiquity. "The revolt of England" was a "transferring to the Crown the ecclesiastical jurisdiction hitherto exercised by the Pope in England." The word in this passage which is inexact is "hitherto." And just this *exactness of words* is essential to a correct working out of the results of this period of history; in fact history without this care is no history. In another phrase we get the benefit of all the misunderstandings which are bound to come as the result of an inexact application of the word doctrine: "Political change came first, and the change in doctrine and mode of worship long afterwards." I will give a few more extracts without comment.

> "Mary restored the Catholic faith in England." Under "the Protestant Queen Elizabeth, the revolt of England from Rome became once for all an established fact. Thenceforth, both in politics and in doctrine, England was a Protestant state."
>
> "It is now generally called the 'Roman Catholic Church,' to distinguish it from the 'Catholic' Church of the Middle Ages from which it, and so many other Churches, have sprung."

He also speaks of "the English Protestant Church."[4]

I have mentioned Gasquet's criticism of Seebohm (on page 83).

5. Rev. Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D., LL.D., Principal of the United Free Church College, Glasgow, says:

> "The Church and people of England broke away from the mediæval and papal ecclesiastical system in a manner so exceptional, that the rupture had not very much in common with the contemporary movements in France and Germany. Henry VIII. destroyed the papal supremacy, spiritual and temporal, within the land which he governed;

---

[3] Kurtz: *Church History,* in *The Foreign Biblical Library;* Vol. 2, pp. 316, 317.

[4] Seebohm: *The Protestant Reformation,* 1874, pp. 8, 172, 196, 214, 226.

he cut the bands which united the Church of England with the great Western Church ruled over by the Bishop of Rome. . . . . It would be a mistake to think that Henry's eagerness to be divorced accounts for the English Reformation."

"Cardinal Campeggio actually suggested that the Princess Mary should be married to her half brother. . . . . Cardinal Wolsey adopted his master's plans for a declaration that the marriage with Catharine had been no marriage at all." "The interests of morality were so little in his (the Pope's) mind, that Clement proposed to Henry more than once that the king take a second wife without going through the formality of having his first marriage declared null and void." The Acts of 1534 "completed the separation of the Church and people of England from the See of Rome."

The Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. "deserved special notice, because, although some important changes were made, it is largely reproduced in the Book of Common Prayer, which is at present used in the Church of England." This author does speak of the Articles as a creed, but, on the other hand, speaks of the Creeds as the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian—which is quite a different matter. Under Elizabeth in 1559 the question is debated, not whether there is a Mass; nor whether the Communion is a Mass; but "whether the Mass is a propitiatory Sacrifice." The author is at pains to make clear that the phrase which he constantly quotes, viz., "alteration of religion," means the settlement of details outside the Creed, mainly ceremonial. His own phrase is "settlement of religion." He speaks of the English Roman Catholics, and says, "The unreformed papacy was the running sore of Europe." [5]

Other works used in divinity schools will be quoted on pages 130-135, 247, 248.

Ministerial education bears a close relationship to public opinion and to the work done in schools. We will here take up two books from the Presbyterian seminaries.

1. The Rev. Andrew C. Zenos, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology in the McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, places the "Rise of the Catholic Church" at A.D. 170, which is a date too early for the distinctive features of the Roman Church, and too late for the Catholic Church. He

[5] Lindsay: *A History of the Reformation,* 1907; Vol. 2, Bk. 4, Chap. 1, pp. 315, 316, 323, 324, 331; Bk. 4, Chap. 2, p. 361; Bk. 4, Chap. 4, p. 389; Bk. 6, Chap. 1, pp. 484 and 485.

says that the Thirty-nine Articles have constituted *the Anglican Creed.* Its treatment of the English Reformation is too brief to be of value.[6] This book has marks of authority, and is in all probability the manual from which a large number of living Presbyterian ministers were instructed.

2. Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth of New Haven recently said, in a book which has attracted a great deal of attention:

> "In the main, the distinctive work of Protestants as Protestants has been done." . . . . "The ideal of one organic Church gone out from the firmament of their faith, they will follow some flickering expedients of fraternal conventions, or courtesies of limited exchange of ministerial functions and friendly greetings on neutral platforms, and other such manifestations of mutual respect and occasional charity." . . . . "This is the now evident consequence of a divided Christianity—it is a weak Christianity." . . . "Take to heart the sin, not of original schism, but of continued schism." . . . . "It is a question whether a present schism may not be wrong although a past schism may have been right—how long a schism can be continued without unreason and sin—whether a separation which formerly was necessary may not have left an inherited temper of schism—as a menace to the religious hope of the world." . . . . "If Papacy is a sin against the holy spirit of liberty, equally an absolute independency is a sin against the holy spirit of communion." . . . . "Episcopacy holds the key to the door through which other Churches may be invited to enter with a Catholicism large enough to hold them all."

Dr. Smyth's argument is that Congregational union with the Church of England or the daughter American Church would heal the schism or break with Catholicity which now characterizes Congregationalism, and bestow upon the Congregationalists a Catholicity which they need and which the English Church and American, by virtue of tradition and position, have retained. The whole argument is based on the admitted Catholicity and continuity of the English Church.[7]

---

[6] Zenos: *Compendium of Church History,* with an Introduction by the Rev. John Dewitt, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in Princeton Theological Seminary. The copyright is owned by the Trustees of the Presbyterian Board of Publication & Sabbath School Work; pp. 10, 41, and 238.

[7] Smyth: *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism,* 1908, pp. 10, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 161, 162.

CHAPTER XII.

SOME AMERICAN HOME AND LIBRARY WORKS.

A. L. A. Catalogue—Former President Roosevelt—Journalism—Dr. John Lord's Beacon Lights—Ridpath's History of the World—Lee's Source Book—Larned's History for Ready Reference—Cyclopedia of Religious Knowledge—The Century Dictionary—Cyclopedia of Classified Dates—McClintock and Strong Cyclopedia—Twentieth Century Encyclopedia—The Century Book of Facts—The Standard Dictionary of Facts—Some Test Questions—Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge—The New Schaff-Herzog.

One present difficulty in getting good authorities before teachers and readers will become evident from the following circumstances. The United States government in 1904 issued a "Catalog" of 8,000 books selected for their suitability for public libraries. This list involved a band of experts in enormous labor and reached its present form only after twenty-six years of preliminaries. It is published by the Library of Congress, now practically the one great national library; it was prepared by the New York State Library and the Library of Congress under the auspices of the American Library Association Publication Board; was edited by Melvil Dewey, formerly director of New York State Library, assisted by May Seymour, Education Librarian of New York State, and Mrs. H. L. Elmendorf, Special Bibliographer, Buffalo Public Library. The wide purposes intended to be served by this volume of nearly 500 pages can be gathered from the six great objects stated in the editorial preface, and by the fact that free copies were sent to all the free libraries of the country, while extra copies can be bought for the very low price of 25 and 50 cents. There is every reason to think that this is one of the most important and influential

A Government Publication

bibliographical publications obtainable, and that it is destined to win even a more powerful place for reference and for purchasing purposes.

With the preliminary remark that the list on religion might be improved by expansion and even more in balance, which is more important, let me call attention to this:

> "*Protestant Episcopal Church,* Carpenter, W. B. *bp. of Ripon.* Popular history of the Church of England, etc. "Tiffany, C.: History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.[1]

Now the Bishop of Ripon's book is certainly readable, and attractively made up. But we should expect to find upon the list the brilliant and unique *Introduction to the History of the Church of England,* by the late Henry O. Wakeman. The heading is certainly wrong; an Englishman would not be likely to look for the English Church under the name Protestant Episcopal. As to American history, it certainly was an enormous if not undeserved compliment to include Dr. Tiffany's book, to the exclusion of such a charming sketch as Dr. McConnell's and the full and accurate array of facts in Bishop Coleman's history.

Passing from the Library of Congress to the White House and one whose name was associated with it for nearly eight years, Theodore Roosevelt says that

Theodore Roosevelt

> "The course of the Reformation in England had been widely different from that which it had followed in other European countries."

Here is the warning needed by teachers, in treating this subject; though Theodore Roosevelt himself could have done better than defining the difference as if it merely involved the wishes of Henry VIII., or making the mitigated revolution in England a "revolt" against "the ancient Church." And "What Henry VIII. strove to do with the Anglican Church is what has actually been done by the Czars with the Orthodox Church in Russia." This illuminating parallel has been too often passed over by historians, as we shall notice from time to time, with a resulting inability on the

[1] *A. L. A. Catalog,* p. 73, Section 283.

part of pupils to grasp the Reformation motive and attitude of the English Church.[2]

In modern days it is not a far cry from the White House to the press, which at once forms and expresses popular opinion. A large number of American newspapers are subscribers to a series of articles dealing chiefly with the personal affairs of conspicuous Europeans. These articles appear in perhaps every large center of population, in some places daily. We can make no mistake in assuming for these articles an enormous circulation. Recently this paragraph appeared:

Other American Writers

It was Cardinal Campeggio's

> "refusal to defer to the Bluebeard monarch's wishes in the matter that precipitated the quarrel between that ruler and the papacy which culminated in the separation from Rome and in the establishment of the Church of England."[3]

We may recall Stubbs' feeling that "unsound and sensational" writings, "which pretend to the character of history, are too often welcomed quite as heartily" as the sound ones.[4] We may wait in patience for the crowd to hustle by, till at last we can reach the select society of those who know. Meanwhile, however, there is Dr. John Lord's book, which we should scarcely notice except for the vast advertising done in its behalf and the amazing number of American homes in which it is to be found. Lord gives a small group of authorities, but he seems to follow Froude and Macaulay. The latter he eulogizes in a paragraph which stands not alone as a specimen of his kind of eloquence. In the midst of a very serious task we may pause to take a little amusement and read the passage:

> "But here I must be brief. I tread on familiar ground, made familiar by all our literature, especially by the most brilliant writer of modern times, though not the greatest philosopher; I mean that great artist and word-painter, Macaulay, whose chief excellence is in making clear and interesting and vivid, by a word of illustration and practical

[2] Roosevelt: *Oliver Cromwell*, 1900, pp. 7 and 9.

[3] "The Marquise de Fontenoy," in *The Boston Advertiser*, 15 Aug., 1908, copyrighted by the Brentwood Co.

[4] Stubbs: *Seventeen Lectures*, p. 58.

good sense and marvellous erudition, what was obvious to his own objective mind, and obvious also to most other enlightened people not much interested in metaphysical disquisitions." It is perhaps just as well that Dr. Lord adds another name to the rival reputed founders of the English Church. "Thomas Cranmer framed the creed that finally was known as the Thirty-nine Articles, and was the true founder of the English Church, as that Church has existed for more than three centuries," etc.[5]

Historians who fall into the recurring inaccuracy of confusing Creed and Articles might well read a lesson in the exact language of a less pretentious historian:

"Our Thirty-nine Articles of Religion were drawn up by Cranmer and revised by Archbishop Parker in Queen Elizabeth's reign, but they are not intended as Articles of Faith, but are rather explanations and safeguards to the Faith as set forth in the Creeds."[6]

Like Lord's book, conspicuous through advertising, and one grade better in style, is that of JOHN CLARK RIDPATH, LL.D., Professor of History in DePauw University. This book is singular in ignoring both the continuity and the reform of the Church of England, on their good sides. The evil sides of both appear to be asserted by this writer; the destruction of the Church's Catholicity and the retention of all the evils and abuses.

Popular American Writers

"So far as the religious history of England is concerned, the great fact belonging to the reign of Henry VIII. was the rupture with Rome and the consequent establishment of the English Church. It will readily be perceived that the so-called Reformation in England consisted chiefly in the organic separation from mother Church." "The New Church *in Germany* was a great improvement on Romanism; but in England it would have required a microscope to discover even the premonitory symptoms of a true reform."[7]

I will give a couple of extracts from one of a long series of volumes called *Makers of History* showing how entirely too deep the Reformation movement in England

---

[5] Lord: *Beacon Lights of History,* 1887, Volume on the Renaissance and Reformation, p. 269.

[6] Mrs. Charles H. Smith: *Outlines of Church History,* Pub. E. S. Gorham.

[7] Ridpath: *History of the World.*

was for this author; yet his publishers have got him to the shelves of a large number of libraries:

> "The Church in England is very different from anything that exists under the same name in this country." The curious thing about this sage remark is that there is nothing existing in this country under the same name. The great difference he then proceeds to describe as consisting in the manner of appointment of the clergy to their charges. He says that in this country power in the Church goes from below upward, and that this makes it "diametrically opposite" to the Church of England "in spirit and power." This language displays an entire absence of any grasp of either of the institutions which he undertakes to compare. "Laud," he says, "urged calling ministers priests."
>
> And Henry "abandoned the Catholic faith, and established an independent Protestant Church in England. The Catholics reproached us, and it must be confessed with some justice, with the ignominiousness of its origin." [8]

Doubtless we could find a great many books which, by reason of such statements, are a real reproach to American scholarship. One more will here suffice. A New York woman in an attractive and widely-circulated volume ventures into the field of English Reformation history far enough to say, "the Catholic priest eventually became the Protestant clergyman." [9] The double distinction between Catholic and Protestant, priest and clergyman, is enough to satisfy the most exacting prejudices as to what ought to be. The difficulty is that facts are against it. Possibly a love of architecture might draw this New York woman some day into one or two New York churches which are not devoid of beauty or historical associations, as far as our own country goes. One would think naturally in this connection of old Trinity, St. Paul's, and Grace Church. There are others up-town. In the daily services Mrs. Van Rensselaer would hear the people confess their belief in the Catholic Church, taking the opposite side of the division of Catholic and Protestant, the side opposite to the one on which she had placed them. Possibly, too, some of her friends may possess

---

[8] Abbott: *Makers of History*, Vol. XVI., Chap. 6, pp. 131, 139, and 18.

[9] Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer: *Handbook of English Cathedrals*, 1903, p. 6.

a copy of the book of Common Prayer, in which she might like to search for the word clergyman, only to find priest. This is but one example of several classes of American writers who, with unhalting assurance, boldly place their own notions directly in contradiction to formal, official, and available documentary evidence. Is there not just cause of complaint in such a case?

It would be impossible to tell how many young Americans have received their history from the books of Rev. John F. Hurst, whom the Methodists honored with the office of Bishop. His histories, I believe, have formed a part of the Chautauqua courses for upwards of seventeen years. Bishop Hurst speaks of

> "The new Church of England," of "the new Protestant Church which Henry VIII. would give to England," of "the Church of England as organized by Henry VIII.," of "the people divided into two great bodies—the new Protestant Church of England and the old Roman Catholic Church." [10]

Chautauqua

Another Chautauqua book, in the Reading Circle Series, is by James Richard Joy. The index shows the Church of England from the first. Green is quoted as making Theodore of Tarsus "founder of the Church of England." Mention is made of Bede's *Latin History of the English Church.* Under William, "the trenches were dug for the foundations of an English national church free from Papal domination." Under Henry VIII., "the separation of the Church of England from the Church of Rome." Mary "restored Papal authority in the English Church." Under Edward VI., he gets from Hallam his information that "the real presence of the Body and Blood in the bread and wine of the communion table was explicitly denied."[11] The whole expression is atrocious. From this point onwards he is confused about Catholics. But, from the views cited, it is evident in the Chautauqua course that Joy is not of the school of Hurst.

---

[10] Hurst: *Short History of the Christian Church,* 1893, pp. 293-307. p. 6.

[11] Joy: *Twenty Centuries of English History,* 1898, pp. 49, 51, 76, 170, 186.

Another book by Joy in the same course takes the same line: Augustine was the head of the Church of England. Often before the Reformation he speaks of the English Church and the Church of England.[12]

Macaulay's theory has been effectively spread in this country by Mr. Larned. Like nearly all the books of the present section, Mr. Larned's is a book of enormous circulation, and as far as public libraries are concerned it is found practically everywhere. As an indexed series of extracts various writers are allowed to speak for themselves, but the headings indicate quite plainly the author's bent. The book is a sort of shredded history, and like other shredded articles, it goes into a great many homes, is very handy, and if taken without discrimination is liable to produce distress. The whole thing is index. And we learn that "Christianity" early appears in England, but the Church of England had its "Genesis" at the Reformation. Also at the Reformation, the Church of England had its "origin" and "establishment," 1527-1534. It is quite noticeable that in the volume on "Recent History," a title is assigned to the Epworth League, another to Christian Endeavor, but none to the P. E. Church or the Episcopal Church, and there is a slight note under "Church of England" in which oddly enough the reader is referred to the heading "Papacy." Under 1306-1393 we find "Resistance to Papal Encroachment," which lets in some light.[13] Mr. Larned tells me that he is not conscious of any injustice in an ecclesiastical way and had no such intent, and is perfectly willing to make a substitution of the word "Reformation" for *origin* and *genesis.*

Guy Carleton Lee, Ph.D., of Johns Hopkins University, says:

> "The struggle between Henry VIII. and the Pope on the question of divorce caused the king to assume the headship of the Catholic Church in England and to take that Church from papal control" (1531). (1533) "The following Act was a further severance of the Church of England from the domination of the See of Rome."

[12] Joy: *Outline History of England,* 1890-1891, p. 50, etc.
[13] Larned: *History for Ready Reference,* 1901, Vol. 2, pp. 810, 856; Vol 1, p. 481.

Reference Books

Of Hooker he says: "No man stands as prominently as the exponent of the doctrine of the Church of England as does this divine"; and he shows that Hooker says (1553-1600), "To make new articles of faith and doctrine no man thinketh it lawful; new laws of government, what commonwealth or Church is there which maketh not either at one time or another?"

Of Wyclif and the Lollards:

"In the fourteenth century began a resistless movement against the Catholic Church. This movement was in the sixteenth century and ended in the establishment of Protestantism in England." [14]

Of the Act 31, Henry VIII., chapter XIV., 1539, he says:

"No single document so well illustrates the attitude of Henry VIII. to the Catholic Church as does the 'Act Abolishing Diversity in Opinions.' In this enactment we find no departure from the tenets of the ancient faith. . . . . Henry VIII. was not a Protestant as to any doctrine except that of papal supremacy."

"The close of the reign of Henry VIII. was marked by a decided movement toward Protestantism. The influence of Cranmer and Cromwell was thrown against the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic Church." These terms are objectionable, particularly "fundamental." They show that Lee has written up England along German lines rather than English. He speaks of the "sudden overthrow of Catholicism"; of "the stringent acts against all practices that recalled the doctrines of the Catholic Church."

"The student should not lose sight of the fact that for a thousand years after the coming of the Anglo-Saxons, as for centuries before, the Church of Rome was the Church in England. Following the establishment of the Church of England in the reign of Henry VIII., a variety of sects contended with the State Church for place and power." [15]

Professor Beard of Columbia in opening this subject follows the lead of Green: "The Church of England, as we know it to-day, is the work, so far as its outer form is concerned, of Theodore of Tarsus." He takes his extracts from Stubbs for the Papacy, its development and its assumption of the work of appointing Bishops, etc. He uses the title

[14] Lee: *Source Book of English History*, 1900, Chap. XV., pp. 234, 236, 300, 301, and 209.

[15] Lee: *Source Book*, pp. 267, 273, 277, and 438.

"Separation of the English Church from Roman Authority." His reprints give Dixon's account as temperate and scholarly, on Parliament and the breach with Rome. He cites Gairdner on the subsequent events; and from Elizabeth he takes Dixon's narrative.[16] This is a notable and late return, by American scholarship, to the conservative English treatment wherein continuity is assumed.

Thomas Wentworth Higginson uses much more moderate expressions than the new line of school historians. He speaks of influences which "soon made the English National Church a part of the Roman Catholic Church." He says that Elizabeth "was determined that the Church of England should be separated from the Roman Catholic Church."[17] "Wolsey began reforms in the Church of England" because "he wished to save the Church by reforming it from the inside."

Encyclopedias, Dictionaries, and Compilations.

I will give extracts from a few other widely used library reference books:

1

> "The Reformed Church of England has come down to us—not a new Church, but merely purged from distinctively Romish doctrine and freed from papal oppression. . . . Unbroken ties of holy orders, the preservation of the ancient doctrines, organization, and traditions of the Church, a Prayer Book compiled almost entirely of pre-Reformation material, prove the present Reformed Church of England to be one and the same with the Church of Christ that had existed in this land from the earliest times." [18]

2

> "Anglican Church: The Church of England especially as maintaining a Catholic character independent of the Pope; usually applied, therefore, to the Church of England since the Reformation. This designation occurs, however,

---

[16] Beard: *An Introduction to the English Historians*, 1906.

[17] Higginson and Channing: *English History for Americans*, 1897, pp. 28, 119, and 101.

[18] *The Cyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, p. 799. Pub. by S. S. Scranton Co., Hartford, 1900. Its contributors are a number of well-known American Protestant ministers, such as Drs. Josiah Strong, J. H. Vincent, and E. E. Hale.

in a provision of *Magna Charta,* 'that the Anglican Church be free.'" [19]

3

"1549: The Communion service is instituted, as now observed in the Church of England." "1563: The Anglican Church, or Church of England, is established." The index shows the Church of England in 1259; the other entries are at Reformation and after. The Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain is reported to have been established in A. D. 156, and under this head is written up the whole of the Church of England. We have also an entry of a Protestant Episcopal Church in Canada.[20] There is no Church with such a name. If, however, the adjectives used are intended to be merely descriptive, their initial letters should, of course, be printed small in place of the capitals.

4

Cyclopedias

"The Reformed Church of England dates from the sixteenth century."

"Up to the sixth century British Christianity had been independent of Rome. . . . . For many ages we hear little of any exercise of jurisdiction by the popes in England: the English Bishops and kings did not permit appeals to Rome. When Wilfrid, Bishop of York, appealed, in A. D. 680, against an English synod which had deposed him from his diocese, and obtained a decree in his favor from the pope, that decree was disregarded in England, even Theodore (Archbishop of Canterbury) himself refusing to obey it."

"William the Conqueror refused to acknowledge the pope as his feudal superior, and declared his right to retain in his own hands the investiture of Bishops and Abbots which the early Saxon kings had possessed."

In the Reformation section we read: "In view of the facts in the last paragraph, it is absurd to say, as Roman writers do, that the source of the English Reformation is to be found in the vices of Henry VIII."[21]

---

[19] *The Century Dictionary,* with Dr. Lyman Abbott as the collaborator in Ecclesiastical History.

[20] Charles E. Little: *The Cyclopedia of Classified Dates.* Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1899.

[21] McClintock & Strong: *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature,* Chicago, 1870, Vol. 3, pp. 197, 198, 199.

5

The eager student might reasonably expect to satisfy his craving for information in a set of volumes bearing a pretentious title. The manner of pressing the sale of this book is thorough and enterprising. It demonstrates the fact that there is a vast amount of money in this country ready to pour itself out at the call of things claiming to be educational without as yet a sufficiently profound and widespread discrimination as to what things are educational in a true and sound way. The truth is that this is the lesson to be derived from not a few of the successful but "shoddy" products noticed in this section. It is to our reproach that such books have attained success, while the best of the home and foreign works remain still too exclusively the friends of the few. Could any other conditions produce a sale in this way? An advance sale is made to professional and business men at reduced rates. Good space is taken in the local daily papers, and publication is made of testimonials from those purchasing in the advance sale, under headings not displeasing to the vanity of the purchasers. By this method agents seem to be covering the country and a vast sale is being achieved. One warning alone should be necessary to check the purchase of this work. The type and print are hopelessly bad. The editor is Prof. Charles Smith Morris, A.M., LL.D., of the Philadelphia Academy of the Natural Sciences; with him twelve "associate editors and special contributors, and more than two hundred specialists."[22] Evidently, here we have brains enough to promise justice to all the largest and oldest institutions of the English-speaking people. We turn to "England; Church of: See Protestant Episcopal Church." On a similar principle, we might expect the history of the United States to be written up under the heading of the Philippine Islands.

There are references to the Church under *"England—literature."* Augustine founded the Anglo-Catholic Church, and Marvin ridiculed the High Church. But what rela-

---

[22] *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia—Library of Universal Knowledge:* Syndicate Publishing Company, Philadelphia, 1908.

tion these had to the Protestant Episcopal Church of England, this article does not say. Protestant is defined as "A member of one of the various denominations of Christians which have sprung from the adoption of the principles of the Reformation in the sixteenth century." If this definition is correct, what shall we say of the Protestantism of the Protestant Episcopal Church which "is directly descended from the Church of England . . . . which claims . . . . to have *kept herself aloof* from all the modern systems of faith?" Rev. John F. Hurst, D.D., LL.D., whose work we have noticed elsewhere, is one of the responsible editors and contributors whose names appear on the title page of this encyclopaedia. The article makes a summary of the Prayer Book, especially of the Thirty-nine Articles, but does not touch the history. The article Reformation, also, is surprisingly scant.

6

"Up to the time of the Reformation, ecclesiastical affairs would be more properly described as the history of the Church in England, as from that period the Church of England dates her existence."[23]

7

There is a Buffalo publication of this class, widely sold by soliciting of agents. The only thing remarkable about this book is the immense number of libraries and homes in which it is to be found. Christian Science is honored with a place, and of course Methodists are to be found, but Church of England there is none. The Mass was introduced into the Church in the year 590. From such a basis, how can one go on to an intelligent reading of the Reformation? In 1549 took place the "Formal establishment of Protestantism."[24] But what were the formalities? This is the

[23] Ruoff: *The Century Book of Facts*, Springfield, Mass, 1903.

[24] Apparently intended to take the place of *The Century Book of Facts*. This is called *The Standard Dictionary of Facts*. It is edited by Henry W. Ruoff, M.A., D.C.L., and published by the Frontier Press Co. 1908. Pp. 68, 82, 691, 708, 709. But Wright: *The New Century Book of Facts*, Springfield, 1909, is free from the errors noted above. Its scanty section on religion is cared for by Dr. Vincent, Methodist, and Prof. McCarthy, Roman Catholic. The English Church is virtually ignored. The editor is the late Carroll D. Wright, and the book describes itself as "authentic, comprehensive, up-to-date"!

year in which the council seized unconstitutional power, from which the nation shortly recovered itself; the year of injunctions ordering or rather leaving two altar lights, providing a Bible for every Church, ordering epistle and gospel read in English at High Mass. Smashing windows and whitewashing over sacred pictures began in this year; doubtless great Protestant victories; but more of violence than of Church law. There was a new law against speaking ill of the Sacrament of the Altar, and there were some homilies to pass as sermons. But where, in all these, was a formal establishment of Protestantism? Exciting as these changes may have been at the moment, seen through the moderating atmosphere of time they are now known to be changes not at all, but adjustments; casting off, with judgment which we can now commend and now condemn, the materials supposed to be outworn or out of style, while the new is put on to give evidence of development and growth. As the quick follow the dead and when dead are followed by the quick again, and society goes on, so the adjustments in the English Church are both so gradual and so superficial that they declare false any theory that the old was succeeded by the new. There is no date for her Reformation. The old works on with the new, and the new stimulates and re-presents the old.

Dictionaries

Inexcusable errors deface the pages of this Dictionary. The meeting in Acts 15 :4-23 is described as a Council of the Church of Rome, and the Roman council of 1854 is omitted from the list. One-half of the space allowed under *Creed* is taken up with remarks on witchcraft. The Nicene Creed is put as the Creed of Pope Pius V. This is an error for Pius IV. In any case the Nicene Creed belongs 1200 years earlier, and more. In the Creed of Pius IV., the first article includes the Nicene Creed with an introduction; but the original and distinctive matter of this Creed is in twelve other articles.[25] This date, 1564, with 1854 and 1870, marks three great steps taken by the Roman Church from

[25] Schaff: *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. II, pp. 207-210.

Nicene or Catholic Christianity to the Tridentine and Ultramontane.

A booklet to go with the last Dictionary propounds some eighteen hundred questions answerable from the Dictionary text, and among them is this: "What Church is founded on the Thirty-nine Articles?"[26] Referring back to the Dictionary, we find no warrant for the question; but we do find an attempt at interpretation of the Thirty-nine Articles in which there is some serious error. It seems likely that this writer prepared this work without consulting such a careful and clear authority as Browne's *Exposition.*[27] It is impossible to treat history in this way.

8

"The Church of England is that branch of the Christian Church which has existed in England from the earliest times." This book traces the growth of Roman influence over the Church, and speaks of the separation of the English Church from Rome."[28]

9

"Anglican Church . . . . A comprehensive name for the Reformation Churches of English origin, including the Church of England and its branches."[29]

10

"Church of England (the present). Commenced with

---

[26] *Some Test Questions on The Standard Dictionary of Facts,* The Frontier Press, Buffalo, N. Y.

[27] Bishop E. Harold Browne: *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles,* 1850-1853, pp. 737-747, particularly p. 745, on Article 31, Sec. 1.

[28] *Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge and Gazetteer,* edited by Rev. Samuel Macaulay Jackson, M.A., with Associate Editors: Rev. Talbot Wilson Chambers, D.D., LL.D., of the Collegiate Dutch Church, New York City, and Rev. Frank Hugh Foster, Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio. 2d Edition, 1891, p. 253.

[29] The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 1908, Vol. I., p. 179. The subsequent volumes of this work have met with some criticism worth recording. *The Guardian,* for instance, said (25 Aug. 1909) of Vol. III: "The German element preponderates . . . The Anglican Church is strangely ignored"; (20 Oct.) of Vol. IV: "The same excellences and the same imperfections reappear. . . . An index to the school of German thought." The article "Church of England" makes slight allowance for the English Church position, but favorably modifies the expressions used in the edition of 1891.

the Reformation, and was formally established in the reign of Henry VIII."[30]

11

The New International Encyclopædia, 1905 and 1906, Dodd, Mead & Co., edited by Dr. D. C. Gilman and Profs. Peck and Colby, gives a view of origin and a classification of the English Church most unfavorable to her official statement of her position, and also treats the subject in a most contemptuous manner (pp. 79, 83 of the volume on "Courses of Reading and Study," and Vol. I., p. 560). But Vol. VI., pp. 744, 746-750, 1903, takes exactly the opposite view.

Two reference books which assume the Continuity of the Church of England are: *The New International Encyclopaedia,* edited by Daniel Coit Gilman, LL.D., former president of Johns Hopkins University; 1904, Vol. 7, under *England, Church of;* and *Harper's Book of Facts,* a classified history of the world, 1905; which has on page 171 an article on *Church of England* with dates from second century to the present time, and the theory of the Reformation as within the Church and not a parting from it.[32]

Here is an evasive and inclusive definition of Church of England: "This designation is used in two senses; first, a general one signifying the Church regarded as continuous, which, from the first triumph of Christianity till now, has been that of the English people; secondly, in a more specific sense, the Protestant Church now established in England as distinguished from the Roman Catholic Church."[31]

---

[30] *The World's Progress,* An Index to Universal History, Compiled by George P. Putnam, A.M., revised and continued to date. 1883, p. 309.

[31] *Encyclopedia Americana,* Vol. 7.

[32] Also in Vol. VI., 1906, pp. 95-100.

CHAPTER XIII.

SOME AMERICAN CHURCH-HISTORIANS.

PROFESSOR FISHER—DR. FULTON AND DR. CLARK—PROFESSOR ROPER—BISHOP WILLIAMS—PROFESSOR HALL—DR. DIX—PROFESSOR RICHEY AND DR. LOWRIE.

Yale University has sent forth the one Church history upon which Americans would rely more than they would upon any similar work by any other American writer. Professor Fisher's book was published in 1887, and in thirteen years twenty-four thousand copies had been sold.

Under Henry VIII. we are told "The Bible and the three ancient creeds were made the standard of doctrine." Under Edward VI: "It was during this season of peril and confusion that the formularies of the Protestant Church of England were framed." It would have been well if the author had indicated, in passing from the "standard" to the "formularies," just what had become of the creeds. The passion for making up new things seems to have seized the historians much more violently than it ever did the Reformers! Again: "A new 'Order of Communion' was issued, which was superseded, in 1548, by the 'Book of Common Prayer.'" It would seem almost essential, in teaching primary facts as Professor Fisher is doing, that the teacher should add that these books were not new creations, but in a line of translations and amended readings. He does not speak of abolishing the Mass, as some writers do, but he says "Latin services were to cease," which is a good part of the truth, but requires to be supplemented by a statement that the same services, or the essentials and main lines of them, were to

Professor Fisher

continue in English. Professor Fisher restores the Mass under Mary, and says: "The martyrdom of Cranmer has been called 'the death-blow to Catholicism in England.'" [1] The phrase will not be forgotten, for the thing has nine lives. Three hundred and fifty years after Cranmer, Dr. Fairbairn dealt another death-blow in his book *Catholicism: Roman and Anglican;* and yet a few years, and Dr. Smyth writes from New Haven on "Coming Catholicism." And Fisher, Fairbairn, and Smyth wrote as Congregational ministers.

Professor Fisher quotes:

> "That the king . . . . shall be reputed the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England, called the *Anglicana Ecclesia.*" And, "Thus the kingdom of England was severed from the papacy, and the Church of England brought into subjection to the civil authority. . . . . The Bible and the constitution of the primitive Church had furnished the grounds for the overthrow of papal supremacy." Fisher thus follows Macaulay:
>
> Henry VIII. "attempted to establish an Anglican Church which should be neither Protestant nor Roman Catholic, but which should differ from the Roman Catholic system only in the Article of the Royal Supremacy. His success was remarkable." [2]

Once he lets himself speak of the Roman Church as "the ancient religion," and perhaps it is natural that he should call it "the Catholic Church," though this he sometimes varies by using "Roman Catholic." He gives no ground for calling the Articles the Creed. Elsewhere, he allows that the Church of England did exist under the same name in the days before the Reformation. He speaks of the system, but not of the Church, as the creation of Henry. But "the Anglican Protestant Church was fully organized," he says, by the time of the accession of Edward VI.[3]

To an American priest and editor, the late Dr. John Fulton, belongs great credit for a series called "Ten Epochs of Church History" (1897). One of these volumes by Dr.

---

[1] Fisher: *History of the Christian Church,* Ed. of 1897, pp. 354, 359, 361, 357, 358.

[2] The same, p. 321, or edition of 1906, pp. 274, 275, 277.

[3] Fisher: *A Brief History of the Nations and of their Progress in Civilization,* by George Park Fisher, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Yale University, American Book Company, 1896, pp. 384, 385, 393, and 403.

William Clark throws some unusual lights upon the period, and is marked by candor, fairness, optimism—besides being remarkably readable. His estimates of the persons involved in the long and trying movement are of great value for their discrimination, charity, and sympathy. As to the Reformation, he is clearly on the side of continuity. He speaks of

> "those who took part in bringing about the independence of the English Church." "England," he says, "had never recognized the right of the Pope to interfere with the government of her national Church; nor had she allowed the members of the Church, unconditionally and without restraint, to carry their appeals to Rome." "Edward the Confessor did more than any other English sovereign to bring the Church of England under the sway of Rome." "In regard to the connection between the new ordinal and the older Latin services, the Reformers took precisely the same course which they had adopted in drawing up the other services. Instead of being chargeable with neglecting the ancient methods and forms, they took the greatest pains to retain all that belonged to Christian antiquity, and removed only those parts which were of comparatively modern origin, and which they regarded as unnecessary or superstitious." "The reformers evidently had no mind to sink the sacerdotal character of the clergy, as they have often been charged with doing." "The principle of the English Reformation was not a claim to return to the mere letter of the Scriptures, but to the institutions of the first ages of the Church and to the word of God as interpreted by the early fathers." In the second Prayer Book, "it is the 'Minister' and not the 'Priest' who is to say the service" (Morning and Evening Prayer).

This is a perfectly proper change from the Catholic point of view. But it is just this change which apparently has led some careless investigators [4] to suppose that the name of priest was removed entirely. By going further into the book they could have seen that the priest always keeps his place and name where it is essential. As to Queen Elizabeth, she

> "did not pretend to be a Protestant. She spoke of herself as one of the 'Catholic Potentates.'" "Amid all the practical questions soliciting the attention of the Primate (Parker), he never forgot the importance of asserting before

[4] As Prof. Cheyney. See forward, p. 152.

the whole Church the true and Catholic character of the Church of England." "The keynote of Jewel's principal work was struck in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross, June 18, 1559, while he was still a presbyter. Jewel was, as we have said, inclined to the Protestant side as opposed to the retention of images, vestments, and the like; but he had a clear conception of the historical continuity of the Church, and had no notion of the reformed Church being a new sect constructed in accordance with certain individual interpretations of the New Testament. In a second sermon at Paul's Cross, he repeated the statements of his first, maintaining the Catholic character of the English Church, and insisting that the characteristic difference between England and Rome was, that the former was primitive and the latter mediæval. 'We are come,' he said, in language repeated in the Apology, 'as near as we possibly could to the Church of the Apostles, and the old Catholic Bishops and fathers, and have directed according to their customs and ordinances, not only our doctrine, but also the sacraments and the form of common prayer.' Finally, even the ancient law of the Church remains unbroken." "As has been remarked by Dean Hook, in spite of several attempts in different reigns to revise the canons, no such revision or reformation has ever been sanctioned by Parliament, so that the Church of England is, at this moment, under the canon law of the pre-Reformation Church, except in so far as that has been modified by statute law." [5]

Dr. Clark

In a paper published in 1901, Professor J. C. Roper of New York, says:

"If you ask in what does this peculiar characteristic of the English Reformation lie—what this strong element was, which assimilated influences from every side, yet dominated them and secured its own result, I reply as the author above quoted,[6] and as the voices of impartial history and authentic documents reply: The *innate conservatism of the nation.* It is this which secured, through all the storms, the continuity of the English Church. Historical higher criticism has been at work with the popular authorities for the Reformation period. The late Mr. Brewer has found, arranged, and published records of Henry VIII.'s reign not seen or

[5] Clark: *The Anglican Reformation,* by William Clark, M.A. (Oxon.), HM., LL.D., D.C.L,, F.R.S.C., formerly Professor of English Literature in Trinity College, Toronto; in the series "Ten Epochs of History," edited by Dr. John Fulton of Philadelphia, 1897, pp. 2, 11, 148, 149, 152, 165, 279, 282, 284.

[6] He has just quoted Beard: *Hibbert Lectures,* for which in fuller form see forward, pp. 196, 197.

read, until recently, since they were stowed away. In the light of this new learning, it has become impossible for any scholar to say of Henry VIII. that he founded the Church of England."[7]

Bishop John Williams says of the English Reformation:

"There is not the smallest thought of separating from the unity of the Catholic Church, far less of founding a new Church. The law of historic continuity is all along asserted and acted on. The appeal is constantly to the ancient customs. . . . . By careful steps and constitutional methods, repellant to those who delight in surprises and effects, situations and displays, but welcomed by all who desire well compacted and well adjusted results, the work goes on. The coat was not torn in pieces in hastily stripping off objectionable fringes. Our reformers with persistency kept always in the forefront of all doctrinal declarations the articles of the Catholic Faith of Christendom."[8]

Professor F. J. Hall says:

"The Anglican hierarchy is truly Catholic, it has retained the essentials of Catholic faith and order . . . . the formal principle of the Anglican reformation is an appeal to antiquity, or to that teaching which has prevailed in the universal Church from primitive days . . . . the teachings of a particular Church must not be inconsistent with the faith of the universal Church. Fortunately the Anglican Communion accepted this principle at the time of the Reformation in unmistakable ways; and . . . . has never forsaken it. We are bound, therefore, ... to interpret Anglican formularies as intended to be consistent with Catholic doctrine." "The point of view from which this work is undertaken is both Catholic and Anglican. The writer believes that the Churches in communion with the See of Canterbury are true portions of the Catholic Church."[9]

A great many American writers, recently and in the few past generations of our life, have written explaining what is meant and believed by Anglican Catholicity and Continuity. We will not give the list; it would fill some

[7] *The Seminarian,* 1901, article on *The Reformation,* pp. 16-30, Esp. p. 25.

[8] John Williams: *Studies on the English Reformation,* Paddock Lectures for 1881, pp. 122-124, and 185.

[9] Hall: *Dogmatic Theology; Introduction,* by Professor Francis J. Hall of Chicago, 1907, pp. 182 and 183 and 184.

pages of this book with names, some widely known, some well-known only in their respective localities. But we may use the name of one who was a patriot and the son of a patriot, the late Dr. Morgan Dix of New York. He wrote:

> "We are made members of the Holy Catholic Church . . . . partly visible here on earth, partly invisible behind the veil. It succeeds the Ancient Church of Israel, and inherits the faith, the traditions, the treasures, and the promises of the past. The door of entrance into the Church is Baptism. . . . . Catholic traditions are retained or permitted by our branch of the Church. . . . . The Faithful Departed . . . . constitute the greatest part of the Holy Catholic Church; we on earth are a small minority of it." [10]

The idea of continuity in the Church is closely connected with the Apostolic Succession. Professor Richey used to say: "The doctrines of Christianity are the logical exponents of its facts." The doctrine of the Apostolic Succession is the exponent of the fact of continuity. One of Professor Richey's comments has been thus expanded by Dr. R. W. Lowrie:

> "Did Henry VIII. *found* or *find* the Church of England? If he found it, he could not found it. He certainly found it; for he did find it, it being there when he came to the throne. If he found it, this is not that he founded it; for while one may find, he cannot found that which already has an existence. While then he may be called a finder, he cannot be called the founder, of the English Church. The founder he could not be, because he found it. If he had not found it, he might have founded it. To say 'he did found it,' would be bad English, as well as false history. We can only say that 'he did find it'—found it in England, and left it in England. He found the identical Church of his fathers and forefathers—a rich find for any one, monarch or subject, prince or peasant. If he had not found it, he never could have founded it, in all the excellence which it then possessed—its heritage from the earliest days, before a Henry was on the throne." [11]

---

[10] *Manual of Instruction*, pp. 39-43.

[11] That Prof. Richey did not work out this matter from a prejudiced mind will be appreciated when we recall his Scottish origin and his service as a Presbyterian minister.

CHAPTER XIV.

SOME AMERICAN TEXT BOOKS.

With Notes on Their Distribution and Comparative Popularity.

While many Americans have carried forward impressions of the English Reformation from Macaulay, who is easily prince in circulation, and others have obtained their impressions from library reference works, few of which are faultlessly fair to all parties; another factor in the creation of opinion is found amongst the young people of the nation in the text-books used in schools and colleges. The vast educational machines of all our cities and states are supplemented by work in 480 colleges, having 263,895 students. Many of these institutions are not under public control. And many, if not more of them, would show in this matter no material variation whether conducted as at present or under civil auspices. At any rate, their influence is very great. It will be of utmost value to estimate the strength of impressions now being circulated under the protection of government. And a government pledged in advance to the teaching of all children of all its citizens without religious bias, and with fairness to all parties, cannot be indifferent to the existence of any words, however few, in a public text, that are capable of partisan construction or a use derogatory to the work or painful to the membership of any existing religious organization; saving only in the case of admitted and proven historical facts, where the facts must be presented as history. But the duty of the state and the interest

of every citizen in the safeguarding of the liberty of the future are distinctly in the direction of the rigid exclusion of one-sided statements, and of material which is alleged, controverted, or doubtful.

To ascertain the texts in use in this country and to obtain some idea of their distribution and comparative popularity, two courses are possible: application to publishers, and inquiry amongst the city and college school boards. It is found that with two exceptions the leading publishers are unable, if not unwilling, to furnish lists of the institutions making use of their history books.

Application was accordingly made to city school boards, state normal schools, and college faculties, to the number of 625 in all, and replies were received representing practically all the great cities and a satisfactory number of the large and small colleges. This was first done in June, 1906. The inquiry was repeated in April, 1909, and the applications were increased in number to 750. The results appear in this section. The college addresses and figures of city population and student enrolment are taken from the New York World Almanac of 1909.

Whatever drift there has been in these years towards change in texts, from older to newer, or from one new work to another, will appear from the tables given with the titles. It is thought that this may be of value to those charged with the responsibility of selecting text-books, as well as pointing out the kind of Reformation teaching likely to be found in various localities and faculties with the duration of influence exercised by the various texts. The tables are, of course, not complete for the entire country, but they are valuable so far as the courtesy of the school boards and teachers mentioned can take them. For their replies to the inquiry, the thanks of all interested are due. The date given with a text indicates the edition consulted, and is used where there is no other indication, to show that the book is of contemporaneous influence and importance. The arrangement of the texts is alphabetical, of the cities is the same; but the colleges are placed in the order of reported enrolment. The number of students enrolled is indicated in parentheses after

the college names. Those referred to as "smaller institutions" are colleges with fewer names than 500 on the roll.

By George Burton Adams, Professor of History in Yale University:

European History, 1899, 1903.

Mediaeval and Modern History, An Outline of its Development, 1903.

Civilization During the Middle Ages, 1894.

1906—Reported by Boston, Cleveland, Fall River, Jersey City, Lowell, Pittsburg, Seattle, St. Paul. College reports say only for reference; Bowdoin, Western Reserve, and Yale.

1909—Reported from Boston, Fall River, Newton, Pittsburg; Ohio Wesleyan University (1286), James Milliken University (937), Vanderbilt University (902), North Carolina State Normal and Industrial College (545), and eight smaller institutions.

Professor Adams says: "The English Church had retained many things in its forms which had belonged to the old Church"; he says that the English Church became Protestant, and the "old" Church he terms "the Catholic." In the use of these names the book is consistent, and never varies or modifies. In undertaking to explain the Order of Bishops in the Church, he states a single theory as if it were a proven fact, without indicating that there is reasonable ground for another theory. Is not this introducing denominational teaching?[1]

By John J. Anderson, Ph.D. *A History of England.*

1909—Reported from Valparaiso University (5,367), and one smaller institution.

St. Alban's story is told in fuller form than in other text-books, which is perhaps a good thing. Montgomery, for instance, reduces the incident to the commonplace. But Anderson is most innocent in his attempt to get at the essence of the reformed Prayer Book, "with its abolition of

[1] Adams: *Med. and Mod. H.,* 1903, p. 240. *Civilization During the Middle Ages,* 1894, p. 109. Gore: *Orders and Unity,* 1909, Pref.

High Mass, its absence of music, and its scant ceremonials." Anderson finds some "Catholics" to index as early as 1605, but he does not find the Church of England until 1662.

By Charles M. Andrews, Professor of History in Bryn Mawr College: *History of England,* 1903.

1906—Reported by few cities. Colleges: Bowdoin, Cornell, Iowa, The College of the City of New York, Charleston College, S. C.; Furnam College, S. C.; Hope College, Mich.; Pritchett College, Missouri; Ohio State University, Ursinus College, Pa.; University of Denver, University of Missouri, University of the South, Vanderbilt of Tennessee, Nebraska Wesleyan University, Western Reserve, and Yale. Reported by six public Normal Schools.

1909—Reported from Brockton, Camden, Chelsea, Leavenworth, Lewiston, Lincoln, Newton, Pueblo, Spokane; University of Pennsylvania (4,500), C. C. N. Y. (4,383), University of Denver (1,324), University of Colorado (1,150), University of Pittsburgh (1,138), Transylvania University (1,129), Vanderbilt University (902), Cornell College, Iowa (755), William Jewell College (528), Dakota Wesleyan University (526), and fourteen smaller institutions.

Andrews says that Henry VIII. "proceeded to destroy the authority of the Pope in England by taking to himself powers, and by removing the English Church from under the jurisdiction of Rome." Andrews is moderate and careful on this subject. "It is to be noted that in all the acts the Pope was invariably styled the Bishop of Rome, and deemed to have no more authority in England than any other Bishop." "The rule of the Church had been that in the Communion," one kind was administered to the people.[2] This is clearly explained, but Andrews refrained from defining for how brief a period this rule had been operative in England. At the time of Elizabeth, Andrews begins to use the term Anglican Church.

[2] p. 264, Note.

Mary "set aside the prayer book of Edward VI. and introduced again the Latin Mass." Here a very slight variation in the words would prove more satisfactory. The comparison would be more accurate between the prayer book and the Latin *services,* or between the *Communion* service and the Latin Mass.

In the time of Elizabeth he twice uses the term "the Roman Church," but elsewhere he speaks of Romans as "Catholics." Of the Church of England he justly says, "Its doctrine and devotions were organically connected with the great ecclesiastical past." He speaks of the Articles as only *defining* the Anglican faith. But in the index he places under "Church, Roman," all the events in the Church of England up to Henry VIII. Both "Church, Roman Catholic" and "Church of England" he begins to index at the time of Elizabeth.

Barnes' General History, by Joel Dorman Steele, Ph.D., F.G.S., and Esther Baker Steele, Litt.D.

1906—Not reported.

1908—Offered in the American Book Company catalogue of High School and College Text-Books, as "pre-eminent as a class-room text" for "its accuracy of statements."

1909—Reported from Lancaster, Wilmington (Del.), Illinois Wesley College (1,097), and one smaller institution.

This book was widely used a generation ago. Its expressions for the Reformation period are moderate and careful.

By Henry E. Bourne, Professor in the College for Women, Western Reserve University, and author of *The Teaching of History and Civics in the Elementary and Secondary Schools* and *A History of Mediaeval and Modern Europe,* 1905.

1909—Reported from Boston, Illinois Wesley University (1,097).

"The Councillors of the young King (Edward VI.)

> . . . . abandoned the policy of King Henry, so that the English Church was not only independent of the pope but became also Protestant in its creed and its forms of worship. It was at this time that the Prayer Book was arranged, and the creed was drawn up which, with slight changes, was to become the 'Thirty-nine Articles.' The Puritans thought that the English Church services had retained too many customs characteristic of the Church of Rome. In Elizabeth's time some of them had wished to decrease the power of the Bishops and to give the ordinary clergy more influence in the management of affairs." [8]

To avoid the use of proper terms, those who do not understand the Church have an awkward mode of paraphrasing. I remember at the time of my passing from the diaconate to the priesthood being asked by some of my relatives and friends of the Quaker tradition if I were "now a full-fledged minister." In the above we should displace the term "the ordinary clergy" with the word priests—or "parish priests."

By Edward P. Cheyney, Professor of European History in the University of Pennsylvania: *A Short History of England.*

1906—Reported from cities: Portland, Ore., Seattle, San Antonio, Jersey City, Louisville, Los Angeles. Colleges: Antioch, Ohio; Central University of Kentucky; Central College, Mo.; Emery College, Ga.; Bellevue, Neb.; Columbia; Cornell; Dickinson; Hedding College, Ill.; Midland, Kan.; Mississippi College; Gustavus Adolphus; University of Minnesota; Ohio University; Rollins University, Ripon, Wis.; University of Richmond, Va.; University of Cincinnati; University of Nebraska; University of Missouri; University of Virginia; Ursinus College, Pa.; Washburn College, Kansas; State University of California.

State Normal Schools: Cheyney leads in popularity.

1908. On application to Ginn & Co., publishers, I received

[8] Bourne: *A History of Mediaeval and Modern Europe,* 1905, pp. 198, 230, and 231.

a booklet without date on Cheyney's history, showing that up to this time the book had been in use at some time in the following: New York State, more than 100 schools; Pennsylvania, 15 schools; New Jersey, 7 cities and 4 schools; California, "55 secondary schools (no other English history is used in more than 17)"; in thirty-two other states, 81 schools and colleges, and the public schools of 37 cities.

1909—Reported from Baltimore, Binghamton, Bridgeport, Brockton, Cheyenne, Chicago, Dubuque, Grand Forks, Grand Rapids, Little Rock, Los Angeles, Louisville, Madison, Manchester, Nashua, New Bedford, San Antonio, Spokane, Springfield (Ill.), Taunton, Toledo, University of Wisconsin (4,500), University of Pennsylvania (4,500), Northwestern University (3,937), Temple College (3,475), University of Nebraska (3,237), University of Missouri (2,536), Purdue University (2,079), Armour Institute (1,805), Tulane University (1,782), University of Cincinnati (1,374), Transylvania University (1,129), Illinois Wesley University (1,097), University of North Dakota (861), Baker University (800), Colorado College (598), Earlham College (525), and twenty-one smaller institutions.

Professor Cheyney says:

> "The established Church from the time of Elizabeth onward is known as the 'Anglican Church,' and its government and belief as 'Anglicanism.'" [4]

The name "Anglican Church" (*Ecclesia Anglicana*) occurs in *Magna Charta,* A.D.1215. Cheyney's text is obviously wrong in using words certain to convey a wrong impression in this matter. His words are quite as faulty as Guizot's, who says that Henry VIII. "had called it the Church of England in order to place himself at its head." [5]

Nor is it true to set "Anglicanism" as a name for its

---

[4] Cheyney: *A Short History of England,* p. 385, note.
[5] Guizot: Chapter 18.

government and belief. Government is one thing; belief is another. Episcopal is the name for this kind of government; the belief is officially set forth in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, called by the Anglican episcopate in 1888 "the sufficient statement of the Christian faith." The person who recites either Creed calls himself a believer in the Catholic Church. Thus both this government and this belief appear to have been well known before Elizabeth's time; in fact, both are up to that time almost co-extensive with Christianity itself. Now read again Cheyney's words, and see if you did not get from them an impression that there had arisen in Elizabeth's time something new in government and belief called "Anglicanism," not previously known to history. This would depend upon your construing of the fourth to the ninth words, inclusive: taken with the words preceding, this would be the sense; with the words following, there would appear a mere change of name. No such change, formal or informal, took place. On either construction, the expression is wrong. There are three reasons why "Anglicanism" is not a suitable name for the English Church "government and belief": (1) It is not official; (2) It has only a restricted use; and (3) Its actual use is in connections hardly within the scope of school and younger college students for whom Cheyney's book was published.

It is not the province of republican institutions or popular texts to attach unofficial or unacceptable names to religious organizations. How informal and unacceptable "Anglicanism" is, may be shown from the recent utterance of an English Church review:

> "A certain theory of the Church has been developed, which it is customary to call Anglicanism. . . . . The Church of England has produced Anglicanism as a theory of Church Government; but Anglicanism is not an adequate or complete definition of the Church of England, or even of its daughter communities."[6]

"The established church from the time of Elizabeth onward" may be taken, and has been taken, by public school teachers, to indicate that Cheyney means establishment in

[6] *Church Quarterly Review*, London, July 1908, p. 260.

Elizabeth's time; that a different church was established from Elizabeth onward from the Church under her predecessors. The first is untrue in law; the second is disproved by history.

Coming from Cheyney's name, "Anglicanism," to the word *Anglican,* we have the name for the group of provinces of the Church of England and her colonial and daughter Churches. These are, as shown above from official and permanent documents, episcopal in government and Christian and Catholic in belief.

The name *Ecclesia Anglicana* is sometimes translated "Anglican Church" but more frequently "English Church" and "Church of England." It is found before Elizabeth, not only in *Magna Charta,* but elsewhere. For instance: In the letters of St. Anselm (who died Wednesday in Holy Week, April 21, 1109), we find the name "the Church of England"; and the words "both Roman and Anglican [English] Churches." [7]

Cheyney gives a clear and good account of Anselm. But Anselm's life involves more than merely political questions. It should be studied also for the ecclesiastical relationships, which were destined to undergo changes which in turn would require the Reformation. The matter is of moment also because the historic situation in Anselm's early days and back of him is a guide to some extent to the determination of a basis for future Christian unity. We are likely, at many times in coming years, to see Anselm's day and its situation put forward as a possible basis for open communion and restored friendship and coöperation between the Churches of Rome and England. This feature therefore forms a part of any real Christian education. It should not be set at one side, because it is not inferior in importance to the legal and constitutional developments of that day: it is, in truth, a situation and a relationship, the restoration of which may yet be attempted with serious and perhaps greatly beneficial results upon the entire Christian world, and one is capable of estimating the extent of these benefits. In teaching his-

[7] Anselm: *Cur Deus Homo,* and Letters, in *The Ancient and Modern Theological Library,* pp. 202, 225, and 165.

tory, the teacher and text-book may well stop to ask, What was the Papacy in Anselm's day? In his letters we read his own account of his elevation to the archbishopric:

> "Being constrained by the fear of God, I yielded me sorrowfully at the command of my Archbishop and to the election of the whole of England and was consecrated." [9]

The observant teacher and scholar will note the contrast between the way of selecting bishops in those days and in these. The modern Roman method is to make all appointments at Rome. Every Roman Bishop to-day is practically made in Rome. It was not so in Anselm's day. If there was a Papacy to him, there was also a measure of home rule unknown in the Roman communion to-day. Anselm was not papist in the modern sense, even when at last, as Freeman says, "the papishes got him." He went as far as the development of his times would lead us to expect. Professor Cheyney says a good deal about Anselm; and it is really necessary to make plain just where such men stood if we are at all to understand the temper that prevailed in the English Reformation. For instance, again, the Roman Church in 1854 made it soul's peril for her people to question the newly-decreed doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.[10] But Anselm says the clean contrary:

> "The Virgin herself, from whom He assumed humanity, was 'shapen in wickedness,' and 'in sin did her mother conceive her,' and she was born with original sin." [11]

This is clearly the supposition of the New Testament writers. And after the span of these 800 years since St. Anselm's death, we find modern Roman Catholicism insisting upon a doctrine which he knew not, and bearing the burden of a "new creed." Anselm's period is Professor Freeman's own ground; and this is his observation, in a letter from Lisieux:

> "Somehow in the kirks here they weary me with their side altars, and provoke me to displeasure with their images.

---

[9] Anselm: *Cur Deus Homo,* and Letters in *The Ancient and Modern Theological Library,* pp. 152.

[10] "Resting on Bible proofs: Genesis 3:15, Song. of Sol. 4:7, 12, and St. Luke 1:28; but some French and German Bishops were strongly opposed." Kurtz: *Church History,* Vol. 3, p. 225, or par. 185, sec. 2.

[11] Anselm: *Cur Deus Homo,* Book II, Chapter 16, first paragraph, or in the A. and M. T. L. as above, p. 86.

> Anselm's religion is another thing; this is so babyish. Can you fancy Lanfranc leading William the Great up to an altar with dolls and flower-pots?" [12]

Going some four centuries back of Anselm, we find Cheyney mentions [13] Bede, but not to lay foundations for the Reformation history, nor for any subsequent movement for resumed relations of the Churches.

Bede was born in the year 673 and died on "the day of our Lord's Ascension," 735. He brings out several points not always allowed for in teaching the history of the Church. When Pope Gregory sends Augustine to Britain, he writes letters of introduction to persons living on the route. One is "to his most reverend and holy brother and fellow Bishop." Bede calls Gregory "Pope of the City of Rome." Gregory admits that customs of the Roman and Gallican Churches may be equally good, and tells Augustine to choose for himself.[14] Gregory himself uses the term, the Church of England; so does Bede.[15] Yet it was a time when Roman efficiency, and primacy exercised over Western but not over Eastern Christendom, was growing into supremacy, and long centuries before supremacy grew into infallibility. Standing on their ancient rights, the Christians of the East had for a century ignored the *Filioque* of the West. There is no need here to explain this, it is simply stated as a fact. Bede's outlook was Western, and he simply ignored the East. He says that Gregory "most gloriously governed" the Roman See and "bore the pontifical power over all the world, and was placed over the Churches already reduced to the faith of truth," and he could say that the Roman was the Catholic and Apostolic Church.[16] Yet this cannot mean what it means to-day with the developments that have taken place. For a century and a half later we find still in England that measure of independence, or at least home rule, which was resumed at the opening of the English Reformation and which has been crushed out in all present Roman Catholic

[12] Stephens: *Freeman,* Vol. II., p. 187.
[13] Cheyney, p. 53.
[14] Bede: *Ecclesiastical History of the British Nation,* 6th and 7th answers to Augustine, *et al.*
[15] The same, 2, 4, and elsewhere.
[16] The same: 3, 29.

countries; viz., in the year 870 we find the king nominating men as Archbishop, and the same in the years 1013 and 1048.[17] It was natural, English, and Catholic for the crown at the Reformation to take up the ancient prerogative.

To return to the name Anglican:

Professor Cheyney, in limiting the name of the English Church to the post-Reformation settlement, is obviously and directly at variance with a great many facts besides those given here. It should be known to teachers, for instances, that a standard book of reference reprints acts and documents of the years 601, 1214, 1215, 1316, 1351, 1390, 1394, 1401—in all of which we find the term Church of England or the term English Church.[18]

Another standard historical reference book shows the same. The name which Cheyney allows "from the time of Elizabeth onward," was used for many centuries before; in the grants of freedom of election to Churches; four times in the Statute of Provisors (1351); that in the reign of Elizabeth's father there is reference (1534—Act of Supremacy) to "the Church of England called *Anglicana Ecclesia.*" This is not *shall be called,* but *has been called.* In 1829 we have "the sacrament of the Mass, as practised in the Church of Rome," and the term "Roman Catholic" occurs nine times in the extracts given.[19] These two books are noticed here because they are in the libraries, they are within the reach of teachers, and they should be carried into class to be read in connection with any such statement as that which has been given in Professor Cheyney's words.

Scholars of Queen Elizabeth's time had no intention of calling the Church Anglican from this day forward, but rather rested in the hope, if not in the certainty, that it was called so from their day both backward and forward. This is well proven by the following, and it must be remembered

[17] *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,* under dates as above.

[18] Gee and Hardy: *Documents Illustrative of English Church History,* 1896, pp. 7, 78, 96, 102 note, 113, 126, 140. Compare Cheney: *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources,* Vol. II., No. 5, U. of Pa., 1895, p. 14, once, p. 15 twice, 2 Henry II., c 15, *Statutes of the Realm,* II., 125-128. Three twelfth century chroniclers and one thirteenth furnish precedents for using the terms "Roman Church" and "Anglican Church."

[19] Adams and Stephens: *Select Documents of English Constitutional History.*

that the term Anglican Church is really an equivalent translation to the term Church of England:

In 1565 was published the first version in modern English of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History.* Bede was born about 900 years before. The significance of this translation lies in the title, and in the purpose which the translator had in view. We may presume that he was distressed at the arrival of the foreign Protestants, Bucer and others, in 1549, and at the results of their work. It was a protest against a Protestantism which was seen to be going too far. It was this which drew the writer to address Queen Elizabeth, and it is a noteworthy record of the contemporary meaning and use of the term "Church of England."

The dedication to Elizabeth says:

> "The pretended reformers of the Church in your Grace's dominions have departed from the pattern of that sounde and catholike faith planted first among Englishmen by holy St. Augustine our Apostle. . . . . I have gathered a number of diversities between the pretended religion of Protestants and the primitive faith of the English Church." With the same object in view, Bede was retranslated in 1723 and 1814.[20]

Now I am devoting more space than usual to this history of Prof. Cheyney's, because it is a recent work; it comes from a great university; and it has attained popularity. The author says: "Thus in outward form at least, there had been introduced a complete organization of Protestantism in place of the old Roman Catholic faith." [21] Here is no admission of any growth, adjustment, or reform from within. The meaning appears to be that this introducing consisted in importing or imposing (and both are from the outside) a complete organization of Protestantism. One might almost suspect him of describing the Scottish Reformation, where men (quite pardonably, we almost admit) expelled one religion and imported its successor.[22] Now it is a pertinent fact that the Church of England has never given herself the title Protestant. Protestantism must be sought and

[20] Stapleton: *The History of the Church of Englande, Compiled by Venerable Bede, Englishman, translated.....Thomas Stapleton, etc.* 1565.
[21] See (forward), Chapter XVII., on the Law. It is all against Cheyney.
[22] See (forward), Chapter XVI., on the Scottish Reformation.

found (1) in those who have rebelled against her, and (2) in parties tolerated in her own membership for the purpose of securing unity. It is notorious that the Protestant sects, parties, and reform societies in England have repeatedly and unceasingly tried to change the Church and her services and her Prayer Book, for the very cause that the Church is not Protestant.[23] The agitation to make it become Protestant is continuing to the present day.[24] This is no news to Prof. Cheyney, for he tells us there was

> "A plan to change the Prayer Book and the rules of the Church in such a way as to make the Dissenters conform to them. The established Church would thereby have been made more comprehensive. But now, as before and since, no way could be found to accomplish it." [25]

He tells us how, in 1664, the Protestants tried to Protestantise, to de-Catholicise, the Church, and could not do it.[26] There was little in the Church to harmonise with a "complete" Protestantism. Her Catholic teaching was, to them, unsatisfactory. These events, tendencies, and perpetual Protestant protests against the Church might have led a modern man like Professor Cheyney to the deduction that the Church was either not Protestant or something besides Protestant. Right at home in Philadelphia, Professor Cheyney has a distinct witness to the Catholic character of the descendants of the English Church. For in 1873, some Protestants in the American Church withdrew from it and made a sect and a Prayer Book of their own, for the obviously correct reason that her teaching is Catholic. Their writings are full of sensational testimony showing their judgment that the Church teaches Catholic faith and methods, and that they, as Protestants,

---

[23] As shown in Frere and Douglas: *Puritan Manifestoes.*

[24] The Kensit protest against the new Archbishop of York was in January, 1909. The same party has been furnishing the public with more evidence of the same kind in meetings as recently as July of this same year.

[25] Cheyney: *Short History,* p. 512.

[26] Cheyney: *Short History,* p. 445 and 446. "There were no longer any Bishops." But what became of them? Does not this leave an impression of a break in the succession? "In 1661 appointments were made to all the old Bishoprics." P. 470. Does not this leave an impression that succession was restored by royal power? There is a kind word for one class of exiles on p. 468, for another on p. 470, but not a word of these Bishops, as if they had ceased to exist. How can we teach history in this way?

never really should have allowed themselves to enter her membership. Says one of them:

> "The hope of having the errors in her Prayer Book expunged by Convention decisions was a desire cherished for years, until, in almost hopeless despair, it was found that within the Church this was impossible, and the only remedy was separation." [27]

The next mark of inaccuracy almost inclines the discriminating reader to the theory that the author might be unfamiliar with the common documents of the Church. Prof. Cheyney says, "The Reformation passed rapidly on to its last stage, that of alteration of religious beliefs." [28] How this statement could be made passes comprehension. The religious beliefs of the laity (who always, of course, make up the bulk of the members of the Church) are expressed in the Catholic creeds. These also form part of the daily devotions enjoined upon the clergy. As they begin with the words "I believe," they certainly have a documentary right to the title "religious beliefs." The composition of the "Articles of Religion" never displaced the Creeds nor changed their interpretation. No alteration was made in our religious beliefs. The changes actually made can be understood and described by a single example. Ideas and customs grew up around the Catholic creeds. "The forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting," acquired a sentiment not foreign to the Creed yet not inhering in it, that the saints departed this life could be addressed to secure their help and favor. Love shown to a saint's statue was, in a way, love shown to the saint himself. Candles burned before the statue showed love for the saint and increased his popularity and the power of his example, and induced others to call upon him for aid. All this is very natural. We do something the same thing ourselves, when we place in a handsome and expensive frame the portrait of one we love. Attention to the picture shows love of the person. A candle before a saint's image showed

---

[27] Mrs. Annie Darling Price: *History of the Formation and Growth of the Reformed Episcopal Church*, 1902, p. 10. This book is presumably authoritative, as it carries a preface by their Presiding Bishop, Latané.

[28] Cheyney: *Short History*, p. 311.

devotion to the saint. Now these were ordered excluded from the Churches. The custom had gone too far. People attached too much importance to the efficacy of the candles. The articles in the creed around which these ideas and customs had gathered in the passing of time, remained untouched.

It is entirely too extreme a statement to give such a name as "alterations of religious beliefs" to such movements as these, neither essential nor radical, hardly touching the ritual, dealing largely with the ceremonial. We have heard it said that a dusty table is still a table after dusting, a dirty face is still a face after washing, and an overgrown hedge (after being trimmed) is the same hedge still. Plainly, the Church of England, in creed, sacrament, and ministry, was the same after as before the Reformation.

Cheyney refers to the Pope as "the head of the Church."[29] Wakeman, in a manner wider, as well as more accurate, speaks of the same area of ecclesiastical influence as the Western Church, and correspondingly he makes mention of the Eastern Church.[30] I find pupils generally have small or no suspicion of the existence of an Eastern Church whose apostolic origin has kept her for all these centuries exactly in the present position of the Church of England; independent of Papal control. The Eastern Church furnishes the exact and only key to solve the riddle of the early independence of the English Church, her vigorous yet unsuccessful resistance to encroaching Roman influences, and her ultimate and present condition of Catholic independence. No fair historian can therefore fail to make explanation of this remarkable parallel, nor use phraseology which will exclude these phenomena from comparison with the English situation. Prof. Cheyney does not bring out the limit praemunire set to Roman influence as partly a survival of the primitive sense of independence. Nor does he show how Theodore of Canterbury, William of Normandy, Stephen Langton, though in Roman orders or pro-

[29] Cheyney: *Short History,* pp. 107, 93; and an equivalent phrase on p. 160.

[30] Wakeman: *History of the Church of England,* pp. 154, 189, "Western"; 70 "Orthodox."

vided with Roman authority, refused to yield to Roman suggestion, on the simple ground that the Church of England was free. The Papacy as it is now understood evidently had no place in their theologies.

Prof. W. E. Collins, in an article published May 7, 1897, says:

"'The power of the Papacy' in the sense of later days was, of course, a thing entirely unknown to the early British Church, as it was to the rest of the Church Catholic."

Prof. Cheyney does not once, I believe, refer to the ministers of the English Church as priests,[31] though he uses the old name for the higher order, Bishops. The name priest was never cut out from any revision of the Prayer Book. It has always stood, just as it is.

It is not therefore, true, that "all priests were banished from the country" (in the time of James I.) unless the qualifying word Roman had been added. The author does not show that he is acquainted with such an historical document as the Book of Common Prayer and its unchanged and even now unchanging features, as he speaks of Catholic priests, of English Church "ministers," and of "clergymen." [32] In all this we see discrimination against official terms and original documents. While the term "clergymen" is used in 1164 in the Constitution of Clarendon, it is of course there used to include priests and those of other orders.

On this point we have two historical circumstances of great weight and interest. The first is the fact that the reformers, when they prepared their directions for conducting ordinations for the future in the English Church, inserted a statement that:

> "it is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons . . . . and to the intent that these Orders may be continued."

This should settle the question whether the reformers

[31] For the possible explanation of some errors in this matter, see before, page 132.

[32] Cheyney: *Short History*, pp. 391, 392; 347, 349, 386, 404, 439, 470, and 489. Cheyney: *Translations and Reprints*, Vol. III., No. 5, 1896, p. 31, shows "clergyman" not a name peculiar to reformed, and "Roman Church" in the thirteenth century in Vol. III., No. 6, p. 15.

intended to continue the order of priests; for they say that they did. It is noticeable that these words have remained where they were set.

The edition from which I first copied them happened to be a print of 1859, and they are the same in 1909. They are printed in every copy of the Book of Common Prayer, continuously since the Reformation. This is documentary and official evidence of a high order, and no such statement of intention occurs in the religious books of any religious body coming out of or since the Reformation; and these words alone would render the English Reformation unique.

The second circumstance is the fact that in their directions for ordination the reformers inserted a provision long supposed to be a rule made at the Council of Carthage, A.D. 398, that Bishops should be consecrated by Bishops, priests by a Bishop with priests, and deacons by the Bishop alone. There can be no question that the English Church carried this peculiar arrangement with the intention of perpetuating the old orders of the ministry with Apostolic Succession.[33] In England and in the allied American Church, this has been the unvarying rule. It proves in the clearest sort of way that the reformers were and that their successors have been guided by the principle of Continuity in retaining the line of Orders which they found, including priests.

It is in the index especially that Prof. Cheyney (or his publisher)[34] discloses the drift of the book as to the origin of the Church of England. For, as Alfred A. Pollard says in an interesting little expert article on "Indexing:"

> "An index may be made as explanatory of aims and standpoints as a preface, and in far greater detail."[35]

So in testing a history, the index often furnishes a

---

[33] Procter: *A History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices,* with an introductory chapter on the History of the American Liturgy, 1889; p. 480. The new *Frere's Procter* could have given this quotation indicating the misapprehension which so long prevailed, but it was aside from their purpose. But it is much to the purpose in showing the reformers' intentions.

[34] I have very kind letters from Professor Cheyney and from Ginn & Company, his publishers, saying that they intend no injustice to any point of view. I am therefore unwilling to retain the criticisms of the book but for the fact that it remains in circulation and has greatly contributed to the general misunderstanding.

[35] In *Cornhill,* reprinted in *The Living Age,* Boston, April 4, 1908.

clue to the treatment of the continuity of the English Church. For instance, in Cheyney, all references to British and English pre-Reformation Christianity are bravely indexed as "Church of Rome." Cheyney evidently wants to stand on the extreme line. He departs even from the precedent of moderate writers who would at least give the pre-Reformation Church the neutral name of "Catholic." In the time of James I., Cheyney finds the "Church of England" for his index, having reached the 385th page of his history. Surely this is the limit of partiality.

Authors often escape responsibility for indices. It is however a fact that indexing has been done on two theories. Cheyney holds one, and stands with Macaulay, while on the other side, indexing all the way through as Church of England, we find Green, Gardiner, Freeman, and others.

Green's indexing is a study in itself. Roman Catholics he indexes beginning under Elizabeth. Before that, English Church begins, with its foundation almost at the very first of his book. There are fifteen items indexed under this head up to Henry VIII., and nineteen after.[36] Repeating this policy, Green again indexes "Catholics, Roman" beginning with Elizabeth's reign, and "Church of England founded by Theodore of Tarsus," and from this the same going forward.[37] He does not index Anglican or Anglicanism. Wakeman does not index Church of England, but the name is found in the text from the beginning.[38]

Under 1552 Prof. Cheyney says: "No clergyman was allowed to use the old Mass or any other form of worship than that established by law." [39]

It is desirable to see the other side of this Act in order to uncover a few facts which Professor Cheyney does not mention. From his words it does not appear, as nevertheless is quite true, that the Act makes no mention of the Mass or of the "old Mass." In section 5, subsection 5, it makes

[36] Green: *History of the English People,* Index.
[37] Green: *Short History of the English People,* Index.
[38] Wakeman: *History of the Church of England,* pp. 30, 35, 37, 46 (twice) 47 (twice), 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 58 (twice), etc., etc.
[39] P. 312. More evidence of Prof. Cheyney's discrimination against the English Church may be found in the *European Background of American History,* 1904, being Vol. I. of "The American Nation—A History, 1300-1600," 28 vols., edited by Prof. A. B. Hart, pp. 201, 202.

provision for continued ordinations of priests, with Bishops and deacons. With the Communion actually "established by law" and the priesthood distinctly retained, it is not clear that there was a break in the main service of old, or that the Mass was abolished or any essential feature of it cut away. What we actually have is simplification of ceremonial and a return to the primitive name. In the first year of Elizabeth we have an act for the administration of the sacraments, and twelve years later we have an act speaking of priests of the Word and sacraments, and in another act of eighty-one years later we have again sacraments, Bishops, priests, and deacons. The sequence displays a continuous presence and recognition of the essential features of the old service. By 1581, the twenty-third year of Elizabeth, the Roman Catholic service is known as the Mass and the national Church service as the Communion. They have their features in common, and they have their differences, the chief of which are ceremonial and lingual, but especially the papal obedience of the priest who says the Mass; the priest who says the Communion service obeys the law and the Church of the land. The names now—not before—become a test of national loyalty. The birth of Holland abroad and the thickening of conspiracies around the throne at home point the need of protection. The Mass or Roman service is prohibited under penalty by this Act of 1581. It is an act of Parliament, not an act of the English Church. It is a post-Reformation and not a Reformation circumstance. It takes place long after continuity of orders, sacraments, priests, have been assured. The continuity of sacramental worship and ministerial priesthood is assumed in the act, it is Roman interference which is aimed at: but it is just this continuity which modern writers intend to deny or practically succeed in denying when they say the Mass is abolished or prohibited. Even with this legal precedent before us, late in time and checked off by defined and limited circumstances, it becomes untrue to say the Mass was abolished, because it conveys an impression beyond the limits of the facts. Pupils understand it in the sense of other Reformations in which continuity of ministry and sacraments was indeed destroyed.

The phrase, legally true within limits, cannot be used in a common audience without creating false impressions. The pupil's mind passes quickly from the legal sense, where the words may be true, to the religious sense, where they are not true. It is a serious error to put the language of 1581 into an act of 1552, it is a serious matter to use the words of any time without laying again the foundation of facts, and it is a serious matter to use the words in any connection when speaking to persons who will understand them in the sense of our Zwinglian and Calvinist traditions. Teachers of history are the last persons who should be reminded of this. They are to be not the authors of confusion, but of understanding.

[By Katharine Coman, Ph.B., Professor of History and Economics in Wellesley College, and Elizabeth Kimball Kendall, M.A., Associate Professor of History in Wellesley College:

A History of England for High Schools and Academies, 1899, 1900, 1902.

1906—Reported from: Augusta (Ga.), Columbus, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Denver, Dayton, Jersey City, Lincoln, Lowell, New York, Pawtucket, Portland (Maine), and Portland (Ore.).

Colleges: for reference only, reported from a large number.

1909—Reported from: Birmingham, Boston, Chelsea, Great Falls (Mont.), Lincoln, Madison, Meriden, Nashua, Newton, Somerville, Williamsport.

Roanoke College (3,348); Transylvania University (1,129); and one smaller institution.

This book recognizes not only the dependence of the Church of England upon the Roman see during the ages before the Reformation, but also that primitive independence which just as certainly went along with it. This is the key to the Reformation as an adjustment within the life of the Church rather than a break off, or a new start upon Holy

Scripture alone. Of the time of William the Conqueror, Coman and Kendall say:

> "Rome had hoped from William's invasion of England closer relations between the Papal See and the English Church, and these anticipations were in some degree realized. . . . The Norman clergy introduced into England the stricter discipline imposed upon the continental Church by Gregory VII. . . . The Conqueror was a faithful son of the Church, and yet the pretensions of Gregory VII. to supreme authority in ecclesiastical affairs were met by uncompromising denial." [40]

One point comes out in this book, of which teachers should take note. An interesting page gives a fac-simile of the closing sentences and signatures of the Charter of Battle Abbey (1087) and among the signatures we find Bishops of Winchester, York, Exeter, Rochester, and Chester made respectively as Wint, Ebor, Exon, Rot, Cestren—in the same form and style as that now in use by their successors of to-day.[41]

Who can doubt that every English Bishop who thus signs himself after the ancient model intends to assert the identity and continuity of his see and orders with those of the most ancient times? In a long life like that of the English Church, an incident like the Reformation, with its causes and results, is but as a sleep, a fever, a wound, or a battle, with awakening, convalescence, recovery, or peace, in a human life of somewhat more than ordinary strenuousness. As tendencies to death are overcome by the stronger power of life, so the experiences of the Church increase her fame and her usefulness through the unconquerable and unquenchable Presence of the Holy Spirit.

Coman & Kendall's second paragraph on "The Protestant Revolution" certainly could not well be taught, and seriously needs some qualifications.[42] What exactly was done, and who was responsible for it? There seems to be some confusion. This History starts to describe the other and larger portion of the Western Church as the Church of Rome, but as soon as its agents get into English affairs they become "the Catholics." One cannot avoid being amused at the inno-

[40] Ed. of 1900, pp. 83 and 85. [41] P. 87. [42] P. 238.

cence of the tale that "many of them" ("the Catholics") found their way into the Anglican Church and formed the "nucleus of the High Church party."[43] It would be just as fair to add that many of the Calvinists and Puritans found their way also into the Anglican Church, or rather were kept there by Calvin's advice, to form the nucleus of the Low Church party. Then "the Puritan party . . . thought more of conduct than of Church government."[44] Surely this raises a false issue. It may be imputed to all parties and all sects and Churches that they have thought more of conduct than of government, if they were at all true to their own standards; and all government is but a means to the end.

There is something on Wesley, but no mention of other leaders and their achievements. The treatment of the modern religious movements is indeed scant.

To return to the Reformation period for one more paragraph. We are told rightly under "The Protestant Reformation": "The divorce question . . . opened the way to separation from Rome and reform in the Church." With equal truth it might have been added that the reforms were on the way without the divorce, and would have arrived anyway. They had started, and England must have faced them. Historians should always put that item into their story. Then "To all appearances the Church in England was never so strong as at the accession of Henry VIII."[45] That this might have been written Church *of* England is shown by some lines only four pages after this: "Parliament now declared the Pope to have no more authority over the Church of England than any other foreign Bishop, and by the Act of Supremacy (1534) the king was made supreme head of the Church of England." It is only fair to say that this declaration, using the very words Church of England, is quoted correctly in nearly all the school histories. If *this* was the Church of England, then of course to speak of its foundation in the time of Elizabeth or Edward VI. is absurd. The words of the Act intimate that Henry was a new head of an old organization. Henry's Church was the Church of

[43] P. 263. [44] P. 287. [45] P. 227.

Magna Charta and Anselm, the "Church of England." We regret the use of the words doctrine and doctrinal.[46] While justified by precedent, the terms were differently understood by the average reader of some years past. It becomes now an occasion of error as to what was really intended and accomplished by reformers. The doctrinal discussion of to-day and to-morrow centers around the Articles of the Apostles' Creed, which were accepted by the Reformers without question or strife. This always escapes the younger student. If the new movements require the use of the term doctrinal, there should be an effort made to get before the mind an idea that the change did not involve the old creeds. Too many people already say that the Creed was changed at the Reformation; a statement entirely untrue.

The Index is after the approved manner of Green and his line of English later historians. A sentence like this should be readjusted: "Less than two hundred out of nine thousand (parish clergy) remained true to Rome."[47] That is, the majority, or over 8,800 out of 9,000, remained true to the English Church: such a vast majority is entitled to equal praise, and the words "remained true" certainly carry praise.

By H. H. Guerber: *The Story of the English,* 1898. 1909—Reported from Hartford, Paterson.

In the time of Henry VIII. is an indication of the threefold division of religious opinion into Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Catholic. But this sounds strange: "It was owing to Cranmer that English came to be used in the services of the Church. This marked him as a leader among those who favored Protestant ideas."[48] The term *Roman Catholic* is used a great many times;[49] and the term *Catholic* is often given the same meaning;[50] Roman Catholics are indexed under Wyclif, Henry VIII., Mary, and to Victoria; the Church of England is indexed first under Elizabeth, and

[46] P. 232.
[47] P. 248.
[48] Pp. 219 and 220.
[49] Pp. 225, 228, 238, 244, 252, 254, 281, 285.
[50] Pp. 225, 227, 230, 242, 244, 252, 253, 274, 281, 285.

then on. Nor is Church or Christianity indexed at any earlier time than those above.

By Samuel Bannister Harding, Ph.D., Professor of European History, Indiana University, in consultation with Albert Bushnell Hart, Professor of History, Harvard University:

Essentials in Mediaeval and Modern History, 1905; being one of the series on *Essentials in History.*

1909—Reported: Baltimore, Boston, Brockton, Buffalo, Cincinnati, Newton; also four smaller colleges.

Professor Harding's first bad statement in Church History—bad because only half true—is that the Pope, "as Bishop of Rome, was head of the Christian Church."[51] It would seem that, for the love of accuracy, space could have been spared to write "head of the western part of the Christian Church." Even this would be partial, overlooking the prolonged struggle in England and the easy victory of Roman influence in Spain, Gaul, and Italy; but it would be better than the brief-and-easy, but misleading given statement. He uses the words "the Church which resulted" from the English Reformation.[52] If it is true that "England as a nation" separated "from the Roman Catholic Church," there is a corresponding truth that the English Church as a Church separated from the growing imperial and civil functions of the papacy which she was extending over the western world. The movement cannot alone be represented as a political move against the Roman Church without also being explained as a religious move against a power that was in politics. Prof. Harding notes that "Resistance to the Papacy was embodied in the Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire." Queen Mary was a "Catholic" and restored the "Catholic religion," which was "the old religion." In Elizabeth's reign, "Catholic priests and laymen were put to death for refusing to conform to the new religion." Just where he does not need the word Roman, he puts it in; "hatred of Roman Catholicism put Charles I. to death," when it was really hatred of Cath-

---

[51] P. 24.

[52] P. 313.

olicism in the English Church. And worst of all, "Under Cranmer . . . a Protestant creed was adopted." [53] We have always thought there were three Creeds—Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian—and that all were continuously used in England. We can see no advantage in a loose application of the term, certain to produce false impression upon the student.

Professor Harding should be reminded that there is no possible discourtesy in speaking of the Papal Christian Church as the Roman Catholic Church or as the Roman Church. There is plenty of precedent for these terms. For instance, in the year 1122 Pope Calixtus II. makes a concordat with Henry V.; describes himself simply as Bishop Calixtus; and his Church as the Roman Church. Henry's part speaks four times of the Roman Church, and once of the Catholic Church. We only call attention to the bare fact of the use of the term Roman Church at such a time and by such official papers. The same use is traced back to the year 1076. This is sufficient to show both the precedent and the acceptability of the term.[54]

By Edward M. Lancaster, Principal of the Gilbert Stuart School, Boston:

A Manual of English History for the use of Schools, 1877 and 1900. Revised Edition.

This manual was in wide use twenty years ago, but in 1906 was reported from a few cities. It is advertised in the 1908 catalogue of High School and College Text Books, by the American Book Co.

A very few reports for 1909.

Henry "drew up with his own hand the Articles of Religion. These showed that the king had taken the middle ground between Protestants and Catholics." Under Henry "the Church of England" first makes its appearance and again is restored as "the Protestant religion" under

---

[53] Pp. 389, 315, 316, 317, 318.

[54] F. A. Ogg: *A Source Book of Mediaeval History—documents illustrative* etc., edited by an assistant in History in Harvard University and Instructor in Simmons College. American Book Company, 1908. Pp. 279, 280, 273.

Elizabeth, and is described as "the new religion." "Laud sought to *make* the Church of England Catholic in its spirit and practice." The author's want of sympathy and unwillingness to use the proper terms is seen in such expressions as "the Episcopal Religion," "Episcopacy as the national religion," and the king is "an Episcopalian." There is more than a page on Gladstone, and no mention is made of his religious convictions.[55]

By J. N. Larned, formerly superintendent of the Buffalo Public Library, Editor and Compiler of *History for Ready Reference and Topical Reading:*

A History of England for the use of Schools and Academies, 1900.

1906—Reported a small college enrollment of some 7,800 students by replies received: viz., Brigham Young University, College of the City of New York, Wilson College (Pa.), Talladega (Ala.), University of Denver, University of Nevada, Wake Forest (N.C.). It is, however, second in popularity in Normal Schools, and in cities it forges to the front: used in cities aggregating 7,000,000 inhabitants namely, Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Brooklyn, Davenport, Duluth, Detroit, Jersey City, Kansas City (Mo.), Milwaukee, Omaha, Philadelphia, Portland (Me.), Oakland (Cal.), San Francisco, St. Joseph, Saginaw, Washington, and Worcester.

1909—Reported from Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Burlington (Vt.), Keokuk, Lancaster, Madison, Nashua, New Bedford, Ogden, Providence, Racine, Saginaw, Sioux City, Spokane, St. Joseph, Williamsport, Worcester.

University of Missouri (2,536), Transylvania University (1,129), and one smaller institution.

We have "The Separation of the Church of England from Rome"; "making the Church in England an independent Church."[56] Larned has neglected to make note of

[55] Pp. 143, 141, 154, 330, 155, 185, 210 compared with 221, 316, 317.
[56] Pp. 271, 272, 275, 287, and 288, 289, 292, 296, 299, 308, 309.

causes aside from the divorce which operated in making possible the separation "from the Roman Church," but these real causes he records simply as "The Feeling of the English People." Still the summary of Larned is full and fair, more than any other up to this point. His aim to be fair is evident from his taking counsel of such opposites as Dixon and Froude. Under Edward VI. began "more of a change and reformation in the Church than mere secession from Rome." Cranmer, who was responsible for the popularity of such a Catholic document as our English Litany, was "a sincere believer in the doctrines of the Reformation," but Larned does not show both sides of the shield. With more than common discrimination, the Thirty-nine Articles are described as "now maintained in the English Church." We may doubt whether it is quite as true to say that in Mary's reign "Parliament . . . was found willing to restore the ancient service in the Church." Can the Communion be discriminated against in favor of the Mass? Larned's caution returns to him again at once: "Acts were passed which annulled practically everything that had been done in Church matters during Edward's reign, putting them back to about the state in which they were left at Henry's death." On the persecutions under Mary are two excellent paragraphs, quoting Lingard and Ranke, Roman Catholic and German Protestant, with an impartial result in the assignment of results and responsibility. This treatment exhibits a sharp contrast with the method of a writer who appeals in other matters to these same historians, Lingard and Ranke, and to get the other side, if there is any other side, after the presentation of Larned, one should read Cardinal Gibbons' very curious defense of Queen Mary's persecutions.[57] "The new Reformation of the Church" should end as follows: Two kinds of . . . opposition were kept alive . . . one among Roman Catholics . . . according to their own rites; the other . . . prescribed. The alterations in the creed they never secured; in the worship, they were met with a policy of simplified ceremonial.

[57] In Gibbons', *The Faith of Our Fathers*, 1905, p. 301.

"The Reformation in Scotland . . . overturned the old Church. . . Protestant congregations were formed, which took possession of the churches, stopped the Mass," etc.[58] There are still those who suppose this took place in England instead of Scotland, and all the features of the Scottish picture are transferred to the other side of the border. No one draws the distinction better than Larned. Few faults can be found with this book; except perhaps the use of the word "Catholic." The index, however, takes the full form, page 654. Under "Church of England (established)" we have "the separation of the Church in England from the Roman Church by Henry VIII." But we should like to ask, *When was* the Church of England *established?* There is no trace of such a proceeding in Law or Acts of King or Parliament. Otherwise, Larned keeps well within the lines shown in the British Constitution and Laws. It is an admirable text-book.

By Paul Monroe, Ph.D., Professor in the History of Education, Teachers' College, Columbia University:
A Text-Book in the History of Education, 1907.

An important book of immense scholarship, probably destined to be in the hands of teachers everywhere and for a long time to come, for it is unlikely soon to have an equal. It has a valuable chapter on the Reformation. It speaks generally of the *Roman* Catholic Church. This is a good precedent for teachers, who should take the necessary care to be formal and exact, as well as dispassionate, in speaking of the various divisions in or from the Church. It is not the teacher's business to impart bias; the formal name is the only thing that will do.

It is surprising to find that this writer, with views generally penetrating, makes use of a popular catchword which is really misleading in his comparison of "two views of religion."[59] The one finds the truth completed in the authority of the Church, the other in the reason of the individual. These are of course Catholics and Protestants respectively.

---

[58] Pp. 311, 312, 320 and other places, 654.
[59] P. 402.

It is really questionable whether in actual life these two parties adhere to the respective theories so often assigned to them. Everywhere we see Catholics making use of reason and logic, and the sects most free, tolerant, and indifferent to "truth" of a dogmatic kind, are making constant use of persuasion. Persuasion, influence, teaching, preaching, are but authority expressing itself, and the experience of the Church in its faithful members may be equivalent to the reasonings of its individuals.

By David H. Montgomery:

The Leading Facts of English History, 1887-1901.

1906—Montgomery is a prime favorite in the cities, though not in the colleges. It has been used in Brooklyn, Baltimore, Buffalo, Cambridge, Cleveland, Dallas, Des Moines, Duluth, Fall River, Jersey City, Lowell, Portland (Me.), New York City, Reading, Syracuse, Worcester, Wheeling, Youngstown, Philadelphia, Rochester, and Washington. These cities have a population of over eight millions. The colleges specifying this history are Cedarville (O.), Hedding (O.), Howard (Ala.), Hope (Mich.), Newberry (S. C.), Rollins (Fla.), St. John's (Annapolis), Southern University of Alabama, Urbana University (Ohio), Washington College (Tenn.).

1909—Reported from Brockton, Buffalo, Burlington (Vt.), Cambridge, Colorado Springs, Covington, Dallas, Elmira, Fall River, Hartford, Lancaster, McKeesport, New Bedford, New Haven, Paterson, Providence, Salem, Somerville, Taunton, Troy, Utica, Vicksburg, Wheeling, Williamsport, Wilmington (N. C.), Worcester, Howard University (1,000); Benedict College (664), North Carolina State Normal and Industrial College (545), Lincoln Memorial University (500), and twenty smaller colleges.

This is an important work by reason, therefore, of its wide popularity in the public schools. It presents a few pages of "Constitutional Documents" headed with an "Ab-

stract of the Articles of Magna Carta (1215)," opening with the words, "The Church of England shall be free and have her whole rights, and her liberties inviolable." This should be pointed out by teachers and scholars who are called upon to use this book, and parents should call the attention of their children to it. Likewise the next item—the confirmation of the Charters by Edward I. (1297). It should be remembered that it is Hallam who tells us that *Magna Charta* was ratified no less than thirty-two times. Therefore the immense importance of its opening words as historical precedent cannot be exaggerated. Note, too, how Montgomery gives you the language of the Bill of Rights (1689), in which civil legislation is quoted as using the terms, Papist, Popish religion and Church of Rome; the legislation is not against them as *Catholics.*

Some other expressions deserving notice are these: "The king (Henry VIII.), with one stroke of his pen overturned the traditions of a thousand years, and England stood boldly forth with a National Church independent of the Pope."

Henry "established a new form of religion, which in words, at least, was practically the same as that upheld by the Pope, but with the Pope left out."

"England . . . established for the first time an independent National Church, having the king at its head."

Edward VI. "establishes Protestantism".—"He took the next step, and made it (the Church of England) Protestant in doctrine."

"Protestantism was formally and finally established in England under the National Church"; "Henry VIII. suppressed the Roman Catholic monasteries . . . and ended by declaring the Church of England independent of the Pope." These, and what immediately follows, are worded adroitly, as if the author felt some hesitation in his mind or feared criticism in case he adhered strictly to the terms used in his citation from *Magna Charta.* No doubt this discernment has contributed to the popularity of his book.

He calls the pre-Reformation body simply "Church." With or perhaps without a very few slight changes of wording this book would make by far the most non-partisan text-

book I have seen, while the quotation from the Great Charter strangely enough renders the book of unique value among school histories. We must not pass over the fact that the index contains this: "The Protestant Church of England established by Edward VI." Some of the items indexed under the heads "Persecution," "Prayer Book," and "Religion" are certain to give offense to persons of one religion. For instance, we are told that "Edward VI. establishes Protestantism" and "Edward VI. confiscates Catholic Church property." What other inference is possible than that the churches of the one were handed over to the other? To some it would be a surprise to learn the facts, viz., that the "property" does not mean the Churches; and turning to the text we find that some of it was given to found grammar schools! What became of the rest? It went to enrich the administration and their friends. It was not a transfer to the English Church. This whole matter is so badly indexed, and so loosely treated in the text, that it is no wonder young people come away from it with great big false impressions.

Montgomery allows for the existence of the Greek Church which from the first limits Roman Catholicism on the east. Again: "The Catholic worship, which had existed in England for nearly a thousand years, was abolished (1540), and the Protestant faith became . . . the established religion." [60] The difference between Unitarianism and Catholicism is a difference of faith, but I cannot see how the difference between Roman Catholicism, and the English Church, Presbyterianism, and the Methodist, are differences of faith. The careful and regular ministers of all of these bodies hold the same faith in God and Christ and the Holy Spirit. There are differences of administration, and differences of detail or degree, and differences of point of view and of practice, of ritual and of ceremonial, and of sacramental application of the same faith; but it is certainly too much to call it a difference of faith or of religion.

[60] Pp. xxix, xxx, xxxi, 194, 199 and 200, 201, 202, 203, 224, 225, li, xlv, xvii. Montgomery's *American History*, even more widely used than his English, contains an indefensibly partisan statement on p. 74, and on p. 63 puts "English" for *Roman*. See ed. of 1896, or latest editions, pp. 63 and 77.

By Arthur M. Mowry, A.M., Hyde Park, Massachusetts:
First Steps in the History of England, 1902.

"Henry declared himself the true head of the Church, thereby . . . withdrawing his people from the Roman Catholic Church." "In this peculiar way England ceased to be Catholic and began its career as a Protestant nation."[61]

By P. V. N. Myers, A.M., formerly Professor of History and Political Economy in the University of Cincinnati:
General History.

Reported, 1906.—Boston, Lowell, Kansas City, Jersey City, New Haven, Reading, St. Louis, New Orleans, Youngstown, also a few colleges and some Normal Schools.

"England was separated violently from the ecclesiastical empire of Rome. All papal and priestly authority was cast off, but without any essential change being made in creed or mode of worship. This was accomplished under Henry VIII. . . . The English Church, thus rendered independent of Rome, gradually changed its creed and ritual." He speaks of "the secession of the Church of England from the Papal See," and of later kings as "defenders of quite a different faith from that in the defence of which Henry first earned the title." Henry "drew up a sort of creed which everybody must believe. . . . Every head of a family and every teacher was commanded to teach his children or pupils the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the new Creed." This is so erroneous that it cannot be excused. "Thus was the English Church cared for by its self-appointed shepherd. What it should be called under Henry it would be hard to say. It was not Protestant; and it was just as far from being Catholic." Under Edward VI. he uses the expression "changes in the creed" three times on one page. We are told that the Articles "form the present standard of faith and doctrine in the Church of England," and of "the acts of Henry and of Edward by which the new worship had

[61] Pp. 163 and 164.

been set up in the land." "Parliament . . . relaid the foundations of the Anglican Church." [62]

Mediaeval and Modern History: Part II., *The Modern Age,* 1903.

1909—Reported from Boston, Buffalo, Burlington (Vt.), Chelsea, Hartford, Keokuk, Lancaster, Los Angeles, Lewiston, Manchester, Nashua, New Haven, Paterson, Syracuse, Taunton, Vicksburg, Wheeling, Williamsport, Wilmington (N. C.), Yonkers. C. C. N. Y. (4,383), Temple College (3,475), Transylvania University (1,129), University of Notre Dame (920), Benedict College (664), and fifteen smaller colleges.

Makes same mistake about change of creed and ritual. The terms are inexact and unfair. The creed or creeds were not changed; the ritual was rather translated than changed; the ceremonial was simplified, but who would say that it was radically changed? "The Act of Supremacy established the independence of the Anglican Church."[63] The Real Presence was denied.

By Harmon B. Niver, A.M., teacher in New York City Public Schools:

A School History of England, 1904, American Book Company.

1909—Reported from Lancaster, Los Angeles.

Niver explains that in 1066 the Pope was the supreme head of the Roman Catholic Church; gives Wycliff the place of "forerunner of . . . that great struggle which resulted in the separation of Protestants from the Catholic Church"; says that somebody "was burned to death because he refused to believe the miracle of the Eucharist, or Lord's Supper"; that the Reformation was a "revolt against the Catholic Church," spread to England; that Henry defended "not the

[62] Pp. 539, 544, 547, 550, 551, 553, 555. Compare Myers: *Mediaeval and Modern History:* Part II., *The Modern Age,* 1903, pp. 87, 97, 105 (far from being *truly* Catholic) 108, 110.

[63] Pp. 101, 109.

faith of the Church, but the faith of Henry," which makes a nice phrase, but it is not true, and moreover it is no help to understanding the work that follows. The king's Ten Articles, and the king-and-Parliament Six Articles (later described as providing for the Mass and confessional, and forbidding marriage of priests) are said to be *"Creeds."* "Doctrine" and "faith" are much mixed with matters relating to "a simple service in English"; as if that had anything to do with either. The "Thirty-nine Articles of belief are still the *creed and practice"* (indeed a silent creed and a most wonderful *practice;* what does this mean?) "of the English, or Anglican, Church, known also as the Episcopal Church." Cranmer was the "author" of the Prayer Book. The Catholics entered the established Church, formed a party, and drove out the Puritans.[64]

By James Henry Robinson, Professor of History in Columbia University:

An Introduction to the History of Western Europe.

Reported—1906: College of the City of New York, College of St. Angelo (New Rochelle, N. Y.), Guilford College (N. C.), and Pennsylvania State College.

1909—Reported from Baltimore, Brockton, Camden, Columbus (Ga.), Columbus (O.), Grand Forks, Great Falls (Mont.), Lincoln, Nashua, Newton, Pittsburg, Scranton, Washington.

C. C. N. Y. (4,393), Temple College (3,475), University of Missouri (2,536), Tulane University (1,782), Wellesley (1,273), Pennsylvania State University (1,129), Howard University (1,000), College (1,200), Miami (1,149), Transylvania, University of Notre Dame (920), Western Reserve University (914), Vanderbilt University (902), Washburn College (711), State University of Kentucky (678), Lehigh University (662), Virginia Polytechnic Institute (553), North Carolina State Normal and Industrial College (545), U. S. Military Academy, West Point (533), Dakota Wes-

[64] Pp. 50, 122, 134, 167, 172, 174, 175, 180, 194.

leyan University (526), and thirty-one smaller colleges.

This book defines *sacramentum* as "something sacred, a mystery." This is not sufficiently inclusive. Especially in the connection here its inadequacy is apparent, two relevant connotations being excluded: the old military and the later religious, in its special sense. Professor Robinson will find his definition undone in almost the next text-book to which we turn, which gives Bayeaux Tapestry with *"Ubi Harold Sacramentum Fecit."*[65]

He speaks of "revolt of England from the Church," and later of a "revolt of England from the Mediæval Church," and next of a "revolt of the English Church from the Pope." Just which was it?

He says: "A Prayer Book in English was prepared under the auspices of Parliament, not very unlike that used in the Church of England to-day." This is charmingly vague; it makes one guess how much detail the author had in his mind, and also what the average teacher would be likely to make of it. Then: "The Thirty-nine Articles constitute *the creed* of the Church of England." [66] This statement is so inexcusably inaccurate and so harmful that there is nothing to do but to mark it as a falsehood.

By William Swinton:

Outlines of the World's History.

This is one of the older text-books. It was mentioned in the reports of 1906 in a very few cases, and the American Book Company advertised it in 1908. A quarter century ago it was in wide use, but now may be regarded as a survival. The publishers say: "The originality and merit of this book lie in its method of treatment and in the freshness and interest given to the commonest facts." It gives judgment distinctly on one side in the Reformation, and quite unfavorable to the English Church.

---

[65] Tappan: *England's Story*, p. 32.
[66] Pp. 210, 426, 430, 435.

By Eva March Tappan, Ph.D., Head of the English Department, English High School, Worcester, Mass.:

England's Story, a History for Grammar and High Schools, 1901.

Reported: 1906—Several of the larger cities.

1909—Reported from Boston, Fall River, Hartford, Taunton; also three smaller colleges.

Henry's "determination not to submit to the Pope's refusal to declare his first marriage unlawful resulted in the establishing of a national Church." "The Prayer Book of Edward VI. was taken in large part from the old Roman Catholic service." During and after the Reformation period, the author uses the term *Roman Catholic* upwards of forty times, varying to *Catholic* in only one instance.

A picture of Anne of Denmark is appropriate in a book by a Massachusetts woman, and we should expect the note under it to contain an additional line informing the pupil that this is the individual for whom Cape Ann is named.

James II. "attempts to restore the Roman Catholic Church in England"; it was an influence in the Church rather than a Church which he would have restored.[67]

By Benjamin Terry, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor in the University of Chicago.

A History of England, 1904.

A History of England for Schools.

Reported 1906—Butler College (Ind.), Coe (Iowa), Antioch (Ohio), Beloit, Davidson (N. C.), *Franklin (Ind.)*, College of the City of New York, Dartmouth, Johns Hopkins University, Midland (Kan.), Mt. Union (O.), Moore's Hill (Ind.), Ripon (Wis.), *Simpson College* (Ia.), *University of Chicago, University of Iowa, West Virginia University,* Western College (Ohio), William Jewell College (Missouri), *Wittenburg* (Ohio), and Yale—a total enrollment of 23,115.

1909—February: Messrs. Scott, Foresman & Co., publishers, kindly sent me a list showing that Terry's text was then

[67] Pp. 176, 178, 170-347, 217, 267.

in use in only those of the above list which are italicized, and also the following additional: Blackburn U. and Greenville College (Ill.), Wabash and Franklin Colleges (Ind.), Iowa State, Coe and Iowa Colleges, Michigan Agricultural and State Normal Colleges, Hamline University (Minn.), Buchtel and Marietta Colleges and Miami University (Ohio), Carroll College (Wis.), Wellesley College (Mass.), Adelphi College, Brooklyn (N. Y.), Ouachita and Galloway Colleges (Ark.), and the University of Arkansas, Baylor University and University of Texas, Missouri Wesleyan College, Baker and Friends Universities (Kan.), Pacific University (Oregon), and Washington and Lee University (Va.).

Normal Schools—Ypsilanti (Mich.), Indiana (Pa.), Northwestern Territory and Edmond Schools (Okla.), Kirksville and Warrensburg (Mo.).

High Schools and Academies—Joliet, Monticello, and Springfield (Ill.), Marion (Ind.), Marion (Mich.), St. Paul (Minn.), three towns in Iowa, Bishopthorpe School, South Bethlehem (Pa.), two Texas High Schools, two in Missouri, two in Tennessee and Virginia.

1909—Reported from University of Chicago (5,038), University of Pennsylvania (4,500), University of Texas (2,462), State University of Iowa (2,315), Wellesley (1,273), West Virginia University (1,208), Miami (1,149), Transylvania University (1,129), Baker University (800), Iowa College (640), William Jewell College (528), and thirteen smaller colleges.

I have hunted in vain through these text-books for one inspiring line about St. Patrick. Why should such a name and such a record be left aside? The makers of the source-books, who reprint for us dry charters and documents: do they not feel the call of St. Patrick's poem, full of historic and human interest? Rightly has a modern editor described the "Deer's Cry" as "one of the most powerful expressions of faith in the protection of God . . . which has ever been written." Not only has it value in itself, but it is a wonderful testimony to the primitive Christian faith which was the *desideratum* of the reformers in England.

It is water from the pure and undefiled stream of early Christianity. I am happy to say that I have read "the wonderful Irish hymn" in public once a year for ten years, not only for its devotional fervor and its comprehension of the Christian faith, but for its historic value as presenting an almost perfect testimony to the historic faith of the Christian Church. I venture to say its presence in any text-book would be equally gratifying to Irish and Anglican Americans, and probably would seem objectionable to no one.[68]

Fitted out with chasuble and staff, this primitive missionary, this exorcist of heathenism, should be brought to the light, that we may know something of him whom men called "the adze-head, with the head-holed cloak and the crook-headed staff."

Terry's history comes in a large edition for colleges, and a small edition for schools. Professor Terry makes one of his aims "to present with accuracy and simplicity the ordinary body of technical material which reader or student naturally looks for in a text-book on English history." Both editions contain nearly all the expressions I have quoted below.[69]

In A. D. 673 met "the first council of the English Church." In 986 died Dunstan who "soon became the favorite saint of the old English Church." "Nomination by the Pope was clearly a violation of the right, both of the English Church and of the English Crown."

> "In England the ecclesiastical authority of the Pope, although recognized in a general way, had been frequently resented in application as an unwarrantable interference in the affairs of the Kingdom."

The opening paragraph of this chapter, "The Ecclesiastical Revolt of England," is very good. But we find the same forgetfulness of the Orient that we have had to notice in other text-books, for Terry says that the Pope was "the venerable head of the Christian Church."

[68] See James Clarence Mangan's translation; for instance, in Newell: *St. Patrick, His Life and Teaching,* of the series The Fathers for English Readers, 1890, Young: New York; 2 shillings, 227 pages and index. The poem is on pages 95, 96, 97, and 98.

[69] Larger book, pp. 45, 105, and smaller book, pp. 105, 246, 241, 256. Compare 141, 254, 250, 279, 280, 281, 290, 327, 391.

"The effect of this act of convocation was virtually to give to Henry the authority which the Pope had heretofore wielded in the English Church." "The King was moving toward a declaration of the complete independence of the English Church and the reorganization of the English ecclesiastical system upon a purely national basis." These movements should be indicated as return rather than innovation. "No attempt, however, was yet made to change the doctrine of the Church. The Pope was no longer recognized, but the English Church was still Catholic in local government, worship, and doctrine."

The 1549 Prayer Book "was an adaptation of the old Missal or Mass-book, and the Breviary, the book which contains the authorized prayers of the old Church for the seven canonical hours. The treatment of the Mass naturally puzzled the redactors. . . . They went . . . . not far enough to please those who denied the Real Presence and the Eucharistic sacrifice." This is what he says of the revision of the Prayer Book, and it is seldom done as well.

But "England was now once more restored to the Church of the Continent."

Mary had "made up her mind to force Englishmen to become Catholics in heart as they had become Catholics again by the laws of the land."

"Cranmer, unlike Ridley and Latimer, was a regularly consecrated Bishop of the Catholic Church." Indeed!

He speaks of the policy of Elizabeth toward the Catholics of England, meaning the Roman party.

"Laud's innovations were the first step backward to the old Church."

Terry gives a good all-round view of our whole question, with here and there a word only whose full force has not been well weighed and judged. Why should a school historian attempt to decide the question between the Churches? But as an example of his evident aim at fairness, Professor Terry is not afraid to speak a word for an unpopular cause; thus in speaking of the eviction of the unordained, August 24, 1661:

"It is easy to arouse sympathy for the people who are

> turned out of pleasant homes. But it should always be stated, however unpleasant the incident, that these evicted dissenters simply shared in the experience of all those who have found themselves, wittingly or unwittingly, occupants of land or fortunes to which they had no right. In such a case the just and Christian course is politely to give up."

But this does not appear in the larger history.

By Francis H. Underwood, A.M.

A Handbook of English History Based on the Lectures of the late M. J. Guest, 1899.

1909—Reported from Chelsea, New Haven.

At the Reformation "there was a change even in the countries which continued attached to the Papal Church, and the religion of educated Catholics now is very different from the superstition and credulity of the Middle Ages." "It is not to be supposed that people became Protestants at once; it was only by degrees they learned to see that among the things they have been brought up to believe, 'some were untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious.'" Is no note to be made of things which all or some kept finding to be *true*? Can the most conservative area of the Reformation be fairly treated in this way? Tyndale was one of the "fathers of the English Church." This book has the merit of stating six "greatest changes" of Edward VI.'s reign, which, while declared "serious," are at once seen as not fundamental; in fact, they are a mere trifle compared with the division existing amongst Protestants to-day, with the Lutherans, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists practically on one side, the Unitarians, some Congregationalists, and Christian Scientists on the other. Philip's "wish still was to keep [England] faithful to the Roman Church, as Mary had (outwardly) left it." "The Church of England . . . had to a certain extent inclined toward some of the Catholic doctrines." [70]

By Albert Perry Walker, A.M., Master of the English High School, Boston.

Essentials in English History, 1905, in the series

[70] Pp. 390, 404, 406, 415, 416, 428, 431, 444.

"Essentials in History," prepared under the supervision of Albert Bushnell Hart, LL.D., Professor of History, Harvard University.

1906—Reported: Albany, Baltimore, Jersey City, Scranton, Syracuse, San Francisco, Sacramento—cities of about one and one-half million population. Is quite popular with Normal Schools, also has a small record in the colleges.

1909—Albany, Columbus (O.), Madison, Quincy (Ill.), Syracuse; University of Pennsylvania (4,500), Grove City College (Pa.) (655), and eight smaller colleges.

This furnishes an illustration of the plaint with which I introduced Terry's texts; in this case not only is the reference lifeless, but perhaps also wrong: "St. Patrick, then a monk of Tours in France, was sent by Pope Celestine to Ireland as a missionary." [71] Is Mr. Walker certain that Augustine had a crucifix in the front of his procession, or was it "a large silver cross, and by the side of the cross a picture of Christ crucified, painted on wood"?[72]

This book of Mr. Walker's brings in the Church of England as a body having recognizable existence from early days. At Whitby "the English Church"—there it is!—"fell wholly under the control of Rome." If only Mr. Walker had been shrewd enough to have omitted the one word *wholly*. And, "four years after Whitby, Theodore of Tarsus was deputed by the Pope to organize the Church of England in harmony with that of Rome."[73] Here is one of the mysteries of language in which we find the words to be true, but the impression false. Did Mr. Walker know that there were Patriarchs and Metropolitans, Bishops, dioceses, priests, parishes, and deacons in the great East? The Church was conducted decently and in order from St. Paul's time down, and everywhere. It was no invention of Rome. The Roman government had a good deal to teach

[71] P. 44.

[72] P. 45, compare Wakeman: *An Intro. to the Hist. of the Ch. of Eng.* p. 11.

[73] Pp. 49, 50.

about discipline and order, but the Church had some order and orders of her own.

King John's "failure in his quarrel with the Pope greatly increased the influence of *aliens* over the Church in England."[74] That has the true English ring! There is an well expressed page on Wyclif. For the rest, some is good for us to read and teach, and some is not.

But let us get forward to the Reformation.

> "In England, where the national temper was one of independence in thought and action, where the Pope's orders had been repeatedly set at defiance, where the financial demands of Rome roused the most angry resistance, the people were already accustomed to distinguish between Roman Catholicism as a system of belief, and the Roman Papacy as a system of Church government." [75]

This would be made perfect by the omission of the first word Roman; Catholicism and Papacy were truly distinguishable in the estimate of the English people; Catholicism was the inheritance. Henry VIII. is clearly not founder of the English Church:

> "The English Reformation was thus, in its first stage, merely a change in the government of the Church." "Henry prepared the way for a far greater change when he put the Bible into the hands of the laity." "Under Edward VI. the Reformation in England entered a new phase, marked by the adoption of the 'reformed' Protestant doctrines. . . . . Aided by Archbishop Cranmer, (Somerset) quite transformed the Church, causing the clergy to repudiate distinctively Catholic doctrines."

A paragraph "Fundamental Catholic and Protestant doctrines," is so badly worded as to exclude the English Church position as well as the Lutheran position. What is here described as Protestant doctrine is so far at the extreme that it is what even Calvin characterized as profane.[76] "Thus the Anglican Church in its general form was completely established when Edward died."[77]

John Wesley, "at first retained his connection with the established Church, but later organized an independent

---

[74] P. 167.
[75] Pp. 248, 249.
[76] See Kurtz, *Church History* (tr. Macpherson) 1888, Vol. II., p. 305, 306.
[77] Pp. 256, 257, 264, 265, 266, 267.

sect." We do not yet think he did so much as that.[78] This history adds some pages of constitutional document extracts. I would ask why such a phrase as "the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*" in the act of supremacy of Henry VIII. (1534) would not incline our author correspondingly to say "Church of England" (as Montgomery does) in translating the same Latin words in *Magna Charta?*[79] Walker reduces it to "The English Church." At the head of Chapters XXXVI. and XXXVII., Walker puts respectively the portraits of William Ewart Gladstone and Robert Cecil, Marquis of Salisbury; the first, statesman, theologian, and litterateur; the second, statesman, theologian, and scientist; both of them advocates and examples of the Anglo-Catholic way of life.

By Henry P. Warren, L.H.D., Principal of Albany Academy:

Stories from English History, 1901.

Reported, 1906—Several of the cities.

1909—Reported from Hartford.

A very bad error occurs at the outset of the Reformation period: "The Pope was admitted to be the head of the Church in every Christian country." This not only ignores the East, but banishes the least thought of a two-fold obligation of Churchmen, the civil and the religious; the Pope absorbed headship in the last, and was absorbing headship in the first also. The king took hold rightfully at civil headship and went on to gain something in religious headship. They came from opposite directions into debatable territory where there was a clash. But Warren's rough statement is sure to start the pupil wrong. Who can write history and implicitly deny the spiritual independence of the Orthodox East? And had the appointment of Bishops "formerly *belonged* to the Pope"? We have two bad errors on *changing* articles of religion which were really, as the Articles, then *created,* and on their position in the Church, which is not primary, but subordinate to the reg-

[78] P. 451, *cf.* lives of Wesley, by R. Denny Urlin, a London lawyer, 1905, and by Arthur W. Little, D.D., L.H.D., 1905.

[79] P. xv compared with p. xi of Walker Appendices.

ular Creeds. With all this, Warren comes out in favor of the continuity of the English Church, though probably too late to counteract the unfavorable impressions already created: "The English Church was separated from that of Rome." "The sovereign was head of the English Church instead of the Pope." [80]

By Willis M. West, Professor of History in the University of Minnesota:

Ancient History, 1902.

Reported, 1906—Allegheny, Helena, Indianapolis, Jersey City, Louisville, Minneapolis, Seattle; cities of over one million. Its college record is not large.

Reported, 1908—Austin, Galveston. This book is in wide use, but was not asked for in the cards sent out.

We need not take up this book except to notice a crude and unsympathetic description of the early doctrinal settlements; "the opinions of the majority prevailed as the Orthodox doctrine, and the views of the minority became heresy." This generalization ignores the influence of Holy Scripture and logic, and real and supposed apostolic and patristic authority in creating a majority. It is true in a way, but leaves in the mind a practical untruth. We must remember that the last motive in the minds of the Christian Councils was the idea that they were to have their own way, do their own will, or pass their own measures. If they were arbitrary or dogmatic, at least it cannot be said that they were selfish. Their testimony was not to the advantage or pleasureableness of their own feelings or opinions. Throughout they were conscious of a great motive. They were agents to keep—for the world—the message of God. They were witnesses to the beneficence of the truth and discipline of God. The historian who does not believe they were right in this opinion is at least bound to accept this as their point of view. As an influence the Council contributed to the education of thought of the times and to the discipline of life. They cannot be dismissed with sarcasm; they must be

[80] Pp. 191, 196, 255.

reckoned among the old world's achievements of progress for their own times. This is the least justice an unbelieving historian can do. To the Christian, the Council and the history mean vastly more. To him Church history is a sacred study because it is the story of the struggle of the Holy Spirit to bring the light of Christ's truth to the minds and the hearts of men; and he believes that we are infinitely richer, as we should be abundantly grateful to God the Holy Ghost, for His successful pleadings with men in those days of peril.

In support of the above statement, and as a help to working out a difficult and important question, which is too often dismissed by teachers (just because it is difficult) in an arbitrary and superficial manner, I will give an extract from a recent article on the Pan-Anglican Conference of the summer of 1908, adding a few comments which will serve as an aid to those who are willing to work out the relations between witness and authority, and the value belonging to both in reaching an individual conclusion:

> "The decrees of the Ecumenical Councils are only binding because accepted by each diocese or group of dioceses individually. . . . . If what the Bishops arrange is generally accepted, it is good. If it is not, it passes away and is forgotten . . . they have no coercive authority." [81]

The decrees of the Councils are not accepted because they were made binding, but rather they are binding because they have been accepted, plus the fact that they are found serviceable and acceptable to-day to men who look at them with the open mind after a full and hearty acceptance of the prior message of the Christian revelation. This is a hard saying, but it is true. It is not a self-evident proposition, but it is a point of view to be thought out. If the Christian revelation had produced no such process of thought in addition to obedience and inspiration in the Christian life, it could hardly be said to be a revelation.

By George M. Wrong, M.A., Professor of History in the University of Toronto:

The British Nation: A History. In the series *Twen-*

[81] *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1908, p. 283. Dr. Briggs of Union Seminary has shown that the decisions were inevitable, correct, and final; *Church Unity*, 1909, p. 447, par. 4.

tieth Century Text Books, edited by A. F. Nightingale, Ph.D., LL.D., Superintendent of Schools, Cook county, Illinois:

1909—Reported from Duluth, Fort Wayne, Nashua, Sheboygan, South Bend, Springfield (O.), York. Preparatory School of West Virginia University (1,208).

"The religious policy of Henry VIII.—*Roman doctrine* without Roman supremacy—was to be continued." "A new English service book" was *drawn up.* The Prayer Book of 1549 "wholly forbade the Mass." "Elizabeth . . . . *allowed the Mass for a time, but after a few weeks* the *epistle and gospel,* which the Roman Church required to be in Latin, were read in English, as well as the Litany." Are we to understand that the author holds such a change of language equivalent to disallowing the Mass? "Elizabeth . . . . reformed, but would not abolish, the old ecclesiastical system." "Roman Catholics . . . . believed that the son of the martyred Mary Stuart would return to the ancient Church." [82]

The last two sentences seem quite contradictory.

For the purpose of holding in one chapter the results of the colleges and city census on text and reference books, I will here add a few notes on the distribution of several books treated in another chapter. These books were not asked for in my first application, which dealt only with the American text, and Stubbs was not asked for in the second. But a number of professors regarded them as so essential that they were included in the replies and are here given simply to carry forward this investigation just as far as the material in hand will take us.

1906—Gardiner, widely used as reference, is specified particularly in colleges enrolling over 28,000 students, viz., Alma (Mich.), Bates, Butler, Cornell, Iowa College, Illinois College, Hedding College, Howard University, New York University, Morning-

[82] Pp. 290, 294, 301, 315, 341.

side College, Ohio Wesleyan, Ohio State University, St. Stephen's College, Trinity College (Durham, N. C.), University of Kansas, University of Nebraska, University of Michigan, University of the South, and Yale.

1909—Reported from Great Falls (Mont.), Nashua, New Bedford, Newton, Saginaw, Williamsport.
University of Pennsylvania (4,500), New York University (4,026), Syracuse University (3,300), Oberlin College (1,848), Ohio Wesleyan University (1,286), Wellesley (1,273), Dartmouth (1,232), University of Notre Dame (920), Western Reserve University (914), Baker University (800), Lehigh University (662), and fifteen smaller colleges.

1906—Green has probably been more widely used than the replies would indicate, but is specified in colleges showing 8,300 students, viz.: Alma (Mich.), Bowdoin, Cotner University (Neb.), Howard University (Washington), Iowa College, Lafayette, Ohio Wesleyan, St. Lawrence, St. Stephen's, University of Denver (Col.), University of Washington, Westminster (Mo.), Wheaton College (Ill.). It is too large a work to take much of a place in city schools.

1909—Reported from Boston, Great Falls (Mont.), Nashua, New Bedford, Newton, Salem, Williamsport.
Valparaiso University (5,367), Ohio Wesleyan University (1,286), University of Pittsburg (1,138), Illinois Wesley Univ. (1,097), Howard University (1,000), Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute (815), Baker University (800), and two smaller colleges.

1906—Stubbs. The Colleges reporting Stubbs are Augustana College (Rock Island), Harvard, Ohio State, St. Stephen's, Howard University, Washington, and Yale. Total students over 11,000.

1909—Reported from University of Chicago (5,038).

SOME OTHER SCHOOL BOOKS.

An Introductory History of England (1908), by C. R. L. Fletcher, sometime Fellow of All Souls' and Magdalen Colleges, is sure to win popularity in America for its style and method. It is quite unfavorable to the English Church. With it should be used, to show fairly the other side, Dearmer's *Everyman,* or Hollis, or Shipley, noted in Chapter XV., pages 233 and 234.

There would appear to be small reason why this English difficulty should be forced bodily into text-books on American History and with all reserve and impartiality left behind. I have shown how this was done by *Montgomery.* A worse case is *A Source History of the United States,* by H. W. Caldwell and C. E. Persinger, professors in the University of Nebraska (Chicago, 1909), which goes so far as to say that "Henry VIII. called" the English Church, "the Protestant Episcopal Church," and more of the same kind. I am informed that a corrected edition of this book, free from such blemishes, will shortly be issued.

No public school should use Silver, Burdett & Co.'s *American Normal Readers* (1908), which are Roman, half acknowledged and half disguised; and Merrill's *English History Stories* (1909) have also been made under Roman supervision. These differ in kind from those made to favor or please the Roman purchaser, in that in effect, and probably in intent, they *serve* the Roman cause. This kind enters the public schools when religious and denominational teaching is admitted.

Oman: *A History of England* is a fair book, which has been admitted to a few American colleges. (New York, Holt, 1900). It is by an English writer.

Montague: *The Elements of English Constitutional History* (1903), could have about the same said of it.

Medley: *A Student's Manual of Eng. Const. Hist.* (1894), leaves continuity unjudged.

The fine old editions of Miss Yonge: *Aunt Charlotte's Stories of English History* (1876) have not been reproduced in style, but there is a new edition inferior in grade. It errs in American affairs (p. 233).

It is worth note that English school texts do not speak as do the American. Each takes its own line, the English the line of caution, the American the line of radical description, and virtually of condemnation of the standards and avowed intentions of the English Church. It is in the American books you find decision that the English Church was *wrong*. Presumably English writers have some advantage in telling their own story in their own way, and they do not essay to determine that the English Church must be thrown out in its orders, sacraments, creeds. In this country there is no establishment of religion, neither is the State called upon to show that any one religion is mistaken or wrong. There is distinct ground for complaint of the manner in which these matters are treated in American books, departing so far from the cautious expressions of the English. These English books are sometimes criticised by Church people, societies, and papers for failing to catch the point of view of the English Church, or for some matter of terms. But they are fair, nevertheless, compared with our American texts. No party can expect public texts to teach its religious lessons for it, but the only claim is that, as public texts, they should be fair to both sides, or else pass the matters in silence. For instance, Rivingtons offer:

Hassall: *The Tudor Dynasty,* 1909 (2s.).

Hassall: *A Class Book of English History,* 1906 (3s. 6d.).

Robinson: *An Illustrated History of England,* 1908 (3s. 6d.).

And hardly so good:

Edwards: *Junior British History Notes,* 1909, Part II. (1s.).

Edwards: *Notes on British History,* 1909, Part II. (2s.).

Methuen offers:

Davies: *Junior History Examination Papers,* 1909 (1s.).

Wardlaw: *Examination Papers on the Constitutional and General History of England,* 1899 (2s. 6d.).

Wilmot Buxton: *A History of Great Britain,* 1908 (3s. 6d.).

Wallace H. Hadrill: *Revision Notes on English History,* 1907 (1s.).

Snowden: *A Brief Survey of British History,* 1905 (or "Handy Digest." 4s. 6d.).

Walden: *English Records,* 1904 (3s. 6d.).

All of the above are fair where the American books fail. And no doubt just as fair a showing could be made by the other publishers.

NOTE:—Montgomery's *Am. Hist.,* rev. ed. 1910 (pp. 66, 67), withdraws mention of creed as made 1899 (p. 77) and 1896 (pp. 74 and 75). But the short passage still shows five or six opportunities for revision.

CHAPTER XV.

MORE RECENT BRITISH AUTHORITIES.

SIXTY REPRESENTATIVE BRITISH AUTHORITIES ON THE ENGLISH REFORMATION, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE QUESTION OF CONTINUITY: 1. HISTORIANS OF THE NATION; (*a*) DENYING CONTINUITY; (*b*) MIDDLE GROUND; (*c*) ASSERTING CONTINUITY. 2. SOME DICTIONARIES, ENCYCLOPAEDIAS, ETC. 3. SPECIAL HISTORIANS OF THE CHURCH. 4. STATESMEN.

SECTION I. (*a*) HISTORIANS DENYING CONTINUITY.

SIR J. R. SEELEY, formerly Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge says:

> "Are we Catholics? Are we Protestants? said the people. Elizabeth gave them a new variety of the Reformation which we now call Anglicanism from the country itself. She founded what may be called a national church."[1]

Dr. J. F. BRIGHT sees the English Reformation as the separation of England from the Church of Rome; a course for which there had long been reason and desire. He speaks of the Roman as the old Church, considers the Mass as abolished, and as restored under Mary. He sees the doctrine as new, the creed as new, the banished Church as the Catholic Church. Under Elizabeth, England was again forever disunited from the Roman Church.[2]

With Mr. LECKY we have to deal with a historian of remarkable gifts, not above passion in maintaining his independent and Protestant positions, yet withal occasionally so open and fair as to win our admiration. Mr. Lecky is not teaching doctrine or fact, but in *obiter dicta* lets fall his view: "The Church of England, being constructed more un-

---

[1] Seeley: P. 75.

[2] Bright: *A History of England;* by the Rev. J. Franck Bright, D.D., Master of University College, and Historical Lecturer in Balliol, New, and University Colleges, Oxford, 1896. Vol. II., pages 429, 494, etc.

der political influences . . . retained formularies and tenets derived from the *Church it superseded.*" "The great part which kings and lawyers played in the formation of the Church;" "assisted in forming a Church of a very composite character." [3]

Lecky says: "*The Church that was founded at the Reformation* was of all institutions the most intensely and most distinctively English." He speaks of "the Romish practice of prayers for the dead," a practice which is not Romish but a well recognized feature in both ancient Church and modern Oriental Church worship. On the same page he says the English Church had proscribed the Eucharist. This statement is unparalleled.[4]

Mr. Gladstone said of Lecky's *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*:

> "It may perhaps be considered a series of pictures rather than a history strictly so called. . . . . Conscientious labour, profuse information, judicious selection, happy arrangement of detail, are crowned by the paramount and rare merit of a dispassionate love of truth, and a constant effort to be faithful to that love, which has seldom been surpassed." [5]

Mr. Gladstone goes on to give criticisms of Mr. Lecky's accuracy and judgment.

Lord Acton says that Goldwin Smith "is much less given to misrepresentation and calumny than Macaulay." And he speaks of "the defects of Goldwin Smith's historic art; his lax criticism, his superficial acquaintance with foreign countries, his occasional proneness to sacrifice accuracy for the sake of rhetorical effect, his aversion for spiritual things." [6]

Goldwin Smith says: "The Mass was abolished and prohibited . . . . the whole sacerdotal system . . . . was swept away . . . . the Protestant pastorate took the place of the Roman priesthood." Here we feel that the wish is father to the thought. Later, this author calls attention to the retention of the word *priest* and other Cath-

---

[3] Lecky: *The Map of Life*, p. 204.
[4] Lecky: *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, 1891, Vol. 1, Pp. 92 and 167.
[5] Gladstone: *Gleanings*, Vol. VII., pp. 208, 209.
[6] Acton: *History of Freedom*, pp. 234 and 236.

olic principles which served "to make a store of arguments, or pretexts, for the revival of Catholicism in the Anglican establishment at a later day." [7] This is reading history backwards; pushing the ideas of the present backward into the events of the past.

There is a very amusing contradiction between this writer and GUIZOT, who says:

> "In England it [the Reformation] consented to the hierarchical constitution of the clergy, and the existence of a Church as full of abuses as ever the Romish Church had been." [8]

Guizot further says: "The religious reformers" of the time of Charles I. did not like "the Episcopal Church of England as it had been constituted, first by the capricious royal despotism of Henry VIII., and then by the ably designed systematic despotism of Elizabeth. . . . It was, in their eyes, an incomplete, incongruous reformation, incessantly compromised by the danger of a return to the Catholic Church, from which it had never far enough removed." [9]

(*b*) HISTORIANS OF THE NATION TAKING A MIDDLE GROUND, OR INDETERMINATE.

The Rev. Dr. CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE says:

> "No great change in religion or politics is, or can be, the creation of any one man. The leaders of such revolutions are their creatures, not their first cause: they simply act as the agent to bring to a crisis long-ripening preparations. A revolution must be in harmony with the spirit of the age, else it could never be accomplished. All the men who ever introduced a new era in politics or religion . . . . only took the tide of popular feeling at the full, and were borne on by it to the results they attained. They hoisted the sail, and stood at the helm; but the spirit of the age bore them along."

To Theodore of Tarsus "we owe the Church of England, as we know it to-day," he says, closely following Green;

---

[7] Smith: *The United Kingdom—A Political History,* Chap. XIX., pp. 371, 372, 427, 428. Was Goldwin Smith's view mollified and broadened by 1907? For on Nov. 8 of that year he wrote, in the New York *Sun:* "To the Catholic religion as it existed before Popery, and as it seems beginning now to exist again, I feel no hostility whatever."

[8] Quoted by Ridpath: *History of the World.*

[9] Guizot: *On the History of the Revolution in England,* 1890, p. 3.

but shortly after he speaks of "the Reformers who founded our Church under Elizabeth." While he sneers at the "English Catholic" idea, he allows that independence of the Pope and that royal supremacy were "the old English theory." He calls the execution of Anne Boleyn a murder chargeable to the Roman Church, and elsewhere he gives much evidence of a burning hatred of the papal side. He never confesses that the Reformation movement received any impetus from a greed for gain and, like some other writers, pleads a theory of a late introduction of belief in Episcopal orders, though of course the orders themselves for some reason continued to exist before the belief in them. He admits the Catholic character of the English Prayer Book, but only to express his regret, and agreeing with Guizot and the Reformed Episcopalians, he calls it Romish. He is animated by a strong party spirit which prompts him to call those in strict accord with the Prayer Book "conspirators" whom he would eject from the English Church.[10] Their crime is agreement with an official and carefully settled formulary, but a modest sense of humor would have suggested to Dr. Geikie how fortunate he must have been not to have had an ejection movement directed against himself.

Cyril Ransome, M.A., formerly Professor of Modern History in the Yorkshire College, Victoria University, speaks of the Irish and Anglican Churches in the time of St. Augustine of Canterbury, and of the Reformation he says: "The English ecclesiastical reformation of the sixteenth century proceeded along three lines. 1. The separation of the Church of England from the Church of Rome. . . . . 2. The reform of abuses in the English Church. . . . . 3. The changes of doctrine." He might have added that the doctrines changed were not credal or fundamental, though at the time they seemed all important. In the stress of conflict over minor matters, the greater doctrines were taught unchallenged; continuously taught without question. A better perspective and the restoration of good judgment enables the discriminating modern historian to recognize and state fairly what doctrines were changed

[10] Geikie: *The English Reformation,* pp. 1, 4, xii, 186, 276, 494, 504.

and what doctrines were not changed. Ransome uses the expression "separated the Church of England from the Church of Rome." [11]

In the *Cambridge Modern History,* Professor POLLARD says:

> "Every parish church became the scene of religious experiment. Exiles from abroad flocked to propagate the doctrines they had imbibed. Some came from Lutheran cities in Germany, some from Geneva, and some from Zwinglian Zurich. In their path followed a host of foreign divines, some invited by Cranmer to form a sort of ecumenical council for the purification of the Anglican Church. . . . . The clamour raised by the advent of this foreign legion has somewhat obscured the comparative insignificance of its influence on the development of the English Church. The Continental reformers came too late to affect the moderate changes introduced during Somerset's protectorate, and even the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. owed less to their persuasions than has often been supposed. England never became Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Calvinistic. Each indeed had its adherents in England, but their influence was never more than sectional, and failed to turn the course of the English Reformation into any foreign channels. In so far as the English reformers sought spiritual inspiration from other than primitive sources, there can be no doubt that, difficult as it would be to adduce documentary evidence for the statement, they, consciously or unconsciously, derived this inspiration from Wyclif. . . . The Reformation in England was divergent in origin, method, and aim from all the phases of the movement abroad; it left the English Church without a counterpart in Europe. It was in its main aspect practical and not doctrinal; it concerned itself less with the dogma than with the conduct, and its favorite author was Erasmus, not because he preached any distinctive theology, but because he lashed the evil practices. . . . No dogma played in England the part that Predestination or Justification by Faith played in Europe. The Reformation in England was mainly a domestic affair, a national protest against national grievances, rather than part of a cosmopolitan movement towards doctrinal change. Its effect was to make the Church in England the Church of England, a national church, recognizing as its head the English King, using in its services the English tongue, limited in its jurisdiction to the English courts, fenced about with a uniformity im-

[11] Ransome: *An Advanced History of England,* 1895, pp. 29, 406, and 411,

> posed by the English Legislature . . . Mainly on these lines . . . the Reformation continued under Edward VI. The papal jurisdiction was no more . . . . steps had been taken in the direction of uniformity, doctrinal and liturgical; and something had been done to remove medieval accretions, such as the worship of images, and to restore religion to what reformers considered its primitive purity." [12]

From this point on *The Cambridge Modern History* takes a view unfavorable to the Catholic character of the Church of England, partly handled by Professor Pollard and partly by Professors Mullinger and Maitland.

Powell and Tout's History, an English book somewhat used as a text book in a few American colleges, says:

> "The Romans gave us our religion. In the first century Christianity reached Britain and began to spread among the Romanized Britons. Of this early British Church and its history little is known save the names of a few Bishops of London, Caerleon, and York; the sites of a score of churches, ... ; the continuance of certain beliefs not retained in the later Western Church; the origin of a new heresy, the Pelagian, in the fifth century; and a few beautiful legends, such as those of 'good Lucius', of St. Alban, the first martyr of Britain, slain on the hill by Verulam, where now his noble minster stands; of St. Germanus . . . . But it is certain that the Romans left the province Christian . . . . From this Church is descended the Welsh Church, ... the Churches of Scotland and Ireland."

The years about 600 to 800 "are taken up . . . . by the conversion of the English, first begun by Roman, but chiefly carried out by Scottish missionaries, the settlement of the English Church," etc. The authors quote the words of Grossetete to the Pope in 1253: "I therefore, as a priest, a Catholic, a Christian, and your servant, dis-

---

[12] *The Cambridge Modern History:* Planned by the late Lord Acton, LL.D., Regius Professor of Modern History, and edited by A. W. Ward, Litt.D., G. W. Prothero, Litt.D., and Stanley Leathes, M.A. (Vol. II., on "The Reformation" 1904, is a book of 857 plus 25 pages of solid print.) Some of its chapters are headed by names of historians whose other works we have occasion to quote. The chapters on "The Catholic South" and "The Scandinavian North" are written by the Rev. W. E. Collins, B.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London (now Bishop of Gibraltar). James Gairdner, C.B., LL.D., writes on "Henry VIII.": There is no trace of the foundation of a Church. The break with Rome is an episode. The English Church never breaks with her own past. A. F. Pollard, M.A., Professor of Constitutional History in University College, London, writes the chapter on the Reformation under Edward VI.; see also his *Henry VIII.*, 1905, pp. 326 and 327.

obey, deny, and hold evil your commands." The scholar will look in vain through many important histories, as Gardiner, Green, Kurtz, for reference to this important letter; but it is found in the works cited of Moore and Brinkman (p. 258), Terry (pp. 278 and 279), and Wakeman (p. 135). These speak of the Western Church as "the nobler heir of Rome," like Freeman, who calls the Pope the shadow of the Emperor. The Reformation is called "the breakup of the majestic unity of the Mediæval Church," into which of course the word *Western* must be understood if not added.[18]

"Henry VIII. had striven to set up a national church, purged from foreign rule and superstition, a church which would faithfully register the will of the monarch. But the continuity with previous tradition, on which Henry kept a tight hold, bade fair to disappear when the counsellors of Edward VI. established a revolutionary Protestantism, under cover of which they could forward their own selfish interests. Fearing lest ecclesiastical reformation meant revolution, England under Mary went back not unwillingly to the unreformed religion. But neither the one nor the other extreme would permanently satisfy the country, and Elizabeth, in Church as in State, returned to the middle way of her father."

Of Wolsey it is said that "trickery and lying . . . . defaced every step of his foreign policy." "He saw that the Church wanted reform, and though not stopping to amend his own life or to go to the root of the evils, he nevertheless had real remedies to offer."

"Side by side with the theoretical strictness of the marriage law, there was a practical laxity that could hardly be exceeded." "Henry's sister Margaret had easily got divorced in a scandalous way . . . . Louis XII. had brutally put aside his first wife with the Pope's good will." "Thus was the separation between England and Rome completed. Henry boasted that he was no innovator, but was merely carrying out to their logical results the ancient laws, which had upheld the national independence and the supremacy of the crown against the claims of a foreign potentate. His contention was that the Papal supremacy was, in its essence, political, and might be thrown off without any change in the ecclesiastical or religious policy of England . . . While Luther repudiated the whole teaching of the Middle Ages

[18] Powell and Tout: *History of England.* One volume edition, 1900. Three vol. ed., 1885. Powell is Prof. of Mod. His. in Un. of Oxford. Tout is Prof. of His., Owens Coll., Victoria Univ. Pp. 9, 20, 147, 370, 374.

> and set up a new faith and a new church system, Henry, in a more conservative spirit, sought to reorganize the English Church on a purely national basis without any change in its faith, its organization, or its worship. It was a good thing for England that Henry would have nothing of the violent methods of Continental reformers, and gave to the English Reformation that strong political tendency which it has always retained."
>
> "The clergy . . . . strongly disliked the isolation of the English Church from the rest of the Catholic world." "Henry VIII. was honest in proposing to uphold the ancient faith. He had a keen eye for the signs of the times, and the increasing strength of the opposition perhaps taught him that there had been changes enough for the present."

Under Edward VI. we read more of "the reforming of the English Church." The *"First Prayer Book of Edward VI.* . . . . was a very careful and reverent translation of the mediæval Latin services into the vulgar tongue, with a few omissions and additions."

The next chapter heading is "Mary and the Romanist Reaction (1553-1558)." "Parliament . . . brought back . . . . the Mass . . . . leaving the Church as it had been at the death of Henry VIII." It is said "now that the ancient Church had been fully restored" and its members are called "the Catholics."

The Elizabethan settlement is described in terms fairly acceptable to both parties, but continuity is described as "an aspiration," which is one thing it could never be! "The great majority of Queen Mary's clergy remained, reading the Prayer Book instead of the Mass." This is hardly good.

One finds an excellent outline of the difference between the Calvinistic and the Catholic presbyter. In the former, the group called presbyters is divided into ministers who preach and elders "simply to bear rule." In the Catholic system, the group called ministers is divided into three orders, of which presbyters are one. The fact emerges that "minister" in the two systems has two widely different meanings.

Calvin held the Puritans in the English Church, for "though the Common Prayer 'contained much that was antiquated and foolish,' yet they were bound to accept it and

hope for better times." Like Cartwright, they all the while felt that the Prayer Book was " 'an unperfect book, picked out of that popish dung-hill the Mass-Book,' and declared that the Episcopal system was 'anti-Christian and devilish.' "[14]

(*c*) Historians of the Nation Asserting Continuity.

In the section on text-books in use in the United States, we noticed Underwood's edition of lectures by Guest. Guest's book is rather old now, but it is so brightly and clearly written that it retains its popularity. Its Reformation estimates are not reproduced in Underwood. Guest at the outset is free from the notion of the Pope being head of the Church, defining the Western Church as the Church which was under the Pope. He recognizes the English Church before the Reformation; sums up the ante-Reformation grievances as foreign appointments, taxation, indulgences, and the treatment of the newly published Bibles.

Here is an admirable setting:

> "The scholars who took up with the new learning were also most religious and holy men. They were a great deal too wise not to see how corrupt, how disguised, and how spoiled Christianity had become; but they were also too wise not to see how noble and divine a thing true Christianity is. So, in trying to bring in what might seem to be new, these men really went back to the old. They endeavored to throw aside the encumbrances which had been growing up for 1,400 years, and to find out what Christianity was in the mind of Christ and the apostles. And this also they sought to teach to everybody else."
>
> "The Church service was to be in English instead of in Latin." "The Prayer-book contained scarcely anything new; nearly all the prayers were translated from the old Latin ones, which had been used by Christians through many centuries."

The author uses the terms faith and doctrine for a number of things (including mere practices) certainly of minor importance, however eagerly parties of the time may have contended over them. He uses Roman Catholic pretty con-

[14] The same: pp 374, 389, 394, 395, 397, 406, 408, 415, 416, 428, 434, 435, 438, 446, 449, 450, 451, 452.

sistently, and displays nowhere any sign of the foundation of the Church of England.[15]

The Hibbert Lectures of 1883 were written by a Unitarian minister (Dr. Beard) in the interest of Unitarianism, and are concerned mostly with the German type of Reformation. Lecture IX., however, goes into the Reformation in England, and we obtain these results:

> "The English Reformation, both in its method and in its result, is a thing by itself . . . altogether refusing to be classified. When a laborious German compiler [Niemeyer, 1840] enumerates the English among the Reformed churches which own a Genevan origin . . . an Anglican churchman, who is not angry, can only be amused. And in truth such a procedure is conspicuously unfaithful to historical fact. . . . . That after the lapse of three centuries and a half it is still possible to discuss whether the English Church is Protestant or Catholic . . . . sufficiently shows that the Reformation in England followed no precedent, and was obedient only to its own law of development."
>
> "The formal assumption of supremacy by Henry VIII. was but the last stage of a process which had been going on for almost five hundred years. It was an act that could be defended by many precedents, and was fully in accord with national feeling."
>
> "We must take some pains to understand a fact which more than any other differentiates the English Reformation—I mean the continuity of the Anglican Church. There is no point at which it can be said, here the old Church ends, here the new begins . . . . The retention of the episcopate by the English reformers at once helped to preserve this continuity and marked it in the distinctest way . . . It is an obvious historical fact that Parker was the successor of Augustine. Warham, Cranmer, Pole, Parker—there is no break in the line, though the first and third are claimed as Catholic, the second and fourth as Protestant. The succession, from the spiritual point of view, was most carefully provided for when Parker was consecrated . . . The canons of the pre-Reformation Church . . . are binding upon the Church of England to-day, except where they have been formally repealed. There has been no break . . . . in the devolution of Church property . . . . When Cranmer set about the task of providing an English Prayer-book,

[15] Guest: *Lectures on English History*, p. 98, Lecture 11, par. 14, Lecture 21, p. 203, Lecture 40, par. 17, and Lecture 43, pars. 8 and 11.

it was to the ancient ritual of the country that he turned for his materials . . . . If it was a significant thing that Mary's well-known Catholicism was no bar to her almost unanimous and even enthusiastic acceptance by the people, it was equally significant that the measures of her Spanish and Papal advisers wore English loyalty threadbare."

Coming to the time of James I., the ceremonies "stood for the old Church . . . . for its doctrine of the Real Presence, for its theory of priests and sacraments . . . . The external conformity which was asked of the Puritans involved a transition from the Protestant to the Catholic side of the Reformation . . . . It is the peculiarity of the Church of England that she is both" [Catholic and Protestant]. In "the belief in sacramental religion and the possession of a sacerdotal order . . . . she is Catholic. She has priests . . . . and sacraments which only duly ordained priests can minister . . . . I cannot speak in terms too strong of the efficiency of the Prayer-book as a connecting link between the mediæval Church and the Church of to-day . . . I have often heard churchmen confess that it supplies the only form in which they can happily worship; while those who have not been nurtured upon it freely admit the charm of its grave piety, its chastened ardour, the solemn harmony of its periods, the completeness of its adaptation to the daily needs of devotion . . . . It is well that the Prayer-Book should recite no national or local confession, but the symbol of the ancient Church." [16]

Four years later, this was followed up by this utterance by the great Unitarian leader, Dr. James Martineau:

"The Earl of Selborne . . . . makes it clear, by historical evidence, that the Church endowment, including tithes, arose . . . . by voluntary gift . . . . ; so that it stands upon the same footing with the income of Dissenters' trusts."

"By a careful and complete record of the constitutional growth of the English spiritual organization, Lord Selborne furnishes a historical defence of the Church perfect for nearly a thousand years of her development."

"The popular Nonconformist conception of the Church of England as a State-created or State-selected and State-endowed institution, set up by profane intrusion of secular power into spiritual relations, mixes up historical error and

[16] Beard: *The Reformation*, Hibbert Lectures for 1883, edition of 1883, pp. 300, 301, 308, 311, 312, 316, 317, 323-326.

illusory theory into one huge prejudice, in which all accurate distinction is lost." [17]

It is remarkable to note that these strong words in favor of continuity occur in the course of an argument for disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of England along the lines of Dr. Martineau's theories. They are not to be taken as the arguments of a friend, but as the admissions of fact which had to be made by a student of history.

Another historian, W. H. Beckett, says:

> "Had Henry VIII. never reigned, there would have been a history of religious reform in England. The notorious divorce question did but confirm and hasten tendencies which were already at work. A long series of historical facts exercised an obvious influence in producing the critical events which took place in the reign of Henry VIII. Spiritual, intellectual, and political forces were at work, of which the Reformation was the resultant." [18]

Samuel R. Gardiner says:

> "It was by these acts that the separation between the Churches of England and Rome was finally effected." "The Church of England had indeed always been a national Church with its own ecclesiastical assemblies, and with ties to the Crown which were stretched more tightly or more loosely at various times." "In theory and in sentiment the Church of England was still a branch of the Catholic Church, one in doctrine and in discipline with the continental Churches. Practically it was now, in a far more unqualified sense than before, a national Church." "In accepting the doctrines and practices of the existing Church till they were tested and found wanting by a combination of human reason and historical study of the scriptures, interpreted in doubtful points by the teachings of the writers of the early Church, Cranmer more than anyone else preserved the continuity of the Church of England." Archbishop Parker "fully grasped the principle that the Church of England was to test its doctrines and practices by those of the Church of the first six hundred years of Christianity, and he, therefore, claimed for it Catholicity."

The entire period, as treated by this historian, shows no

---

[17] James Martineau: *The National Church etc.,* in the *Contemporary Review,* Vol. XXI., Jan.-June 1887, pp. 410, 411, 423. Supported in his *Life and Letters,* Vol. I., pp. 103, 382, 126.

[18] W. H. Beckett: *The English Reformation of the Sixteenth Century,* 1890.

sign that the Church of England had genesis, origin, or foundation apart from the original foundation. And the index takes the same direction: "Christianity, character of; Early English, see England, the Church of." Under the last head there are seventeen entries before the time of Henry VIII. Rome and Roman Catholic have no entry until the time of Elizabeth.[19]

Gardiner once defines the Mass as the "service of the Holy Sacrament." [20]

Many of these expressions Gardiner uses again in a much later book,[21] notably those asserting the continuity of the English Church. Yet in spite of this historical estimate, he uses the terms *Catholic* and *the old Church* for the Roman Catholic Church, which is one of the inconsistencies observable in writers who follow common terms rather than their own judgment.

Professor Pollard says:

> "There can be no doubt that the Church of England . . . . was consulting both its own interests and those of the nation at large in seeking to come to terms with the secular power and in endeavouring, by the surrender of its best tenable rights and privileges, to retain as much as might be of its catholicity and its connection with the past." Henry "never asserted that he could ordain a subdeacon, baptize, marry, say mass. The whole sacramental system was left in the hands of the Church." "Henry claimed to control the machine, but he did not pretend to supply the motive power; he might select the channels . . . . but he was not the channel nor the fountain." [22]

Arthur D. Innes undertakes to weigh all views hitherto expressed, and in the light of new evidence, to be scrupulously fair to all characters, parties, and movements. We find no statement that the Church of England was founded,

[19] Gardiner: *A Student's History of England,* 1898, pp. 391, 413, 430, 982; also his *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution,* pp. xix. and 243. The latter is Charles I.'s letter giving Catholic Continuity as a reason for not abolishing Bishops.

[20] Gardiner: *English History for Young Folks,* Chpt. XVIII.

[21] S. R. Gardiner: *England,* in "The History of the Nations" Series. Edited by Henry Cabot Lodge, Ph.D., LL.D., Vol. XI., 1906, pp. 253, 265, 276. In estimating the value of Gardiner's testimony it will be recalled that he, like Beard and Martineau, is not a member of the English Church. Gardiner was an Irvingite: *Lord Acton's Letters to Mary Gladstone,* 1904, p. 236.

[22] Pollard: *Archbishop Cranmer,* 1904, pp. 72 and 83.

named, or established during the Reformation, nor any trace of action that would lend support to a statement of foundation rather than reform. He guards us against the common mistake of assuming that the Papacy was ever the Church, by pointing out the independence of the East, in these words: "The Byzantine Church . . . . had separated from the Roman . . . . all Western Europe had acknowledged the supremacy of the papacy." Trent "stood for the Church of Rome . . . . arrogating Catholicity to itself. Hence arose the custom of using the terms Catholic and Protestant as party labels for those within and without the 'Orthodox' pale, in spite of the objection, more particularly of the Anglican body, to its implied exclusion from the 'Catholic' church." "The historian cannot admit that Rome has a right to monopolize the title of Catholic; but during the period . . . . it is difficult to avoid using the current labels, though their adoption is in some degree misleading." For the Real Presence in the Eucharist he carefully quotes the pertinent passages in the Church official documents.[23] And indeed why should not all other historians give the English Church's own record of her own faith in the words of her catechism: "The Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful." This is, in reality, the English Church's charter of continuity in the Catholic Church.

James Gairdner says:

> "What, then, was the main thing done as regards religion under Henry VIII.? Scarcely any one has seriously denied that he was a tyrant, and it is a popular impression that he forced religion into a new mould; some consider that he actually changed it. That he did force it into new conditions seems to me undeniable; but if he made any essential change we shall be driven to consider whether the new religion was not actually a departure from old revealed truth, or at least from a divinely ordained authority. . . . . There is one consideration, at least, on which we may safely rest. It is not in the power of tyranny to deflect the rays of divine truth. . . . Things which abide in religion

[23] Innes: *England Under the Tudors*, 1905, in the series "A History of England" to be complete in six volumes, edited by C. W. C. Oman, Chichele Professor of History in the University of Oxford, pp. 59, 86, 88, 165, and others.

must have truth in them. . . . What has really been ascertained must remain forever. . . . A man . . . . if he is troubled about his faith, let him consider what things have been generally agreed on by Christians of all ages, and be assured that they were not agreed on without inquiry. The things which abide in religion must be true."

"Henry VIII.'s reformation of the Church, it will be seen, was precisely on Lollard lines. . . . Royal power began to act more openly upon Lollard principles, setting itself against images and pilgrimages and things that savoured of superstition. . . . The wonderful thing is really, not how much was destroyed, but how much was preserved. . . . But conservative principles still maintained themselves in the Church, and preserved the Church itself. Bishops were absolutely necessary to the policy alike of Henry VIII. and his successors, though abbots and priors were not; and the old Bishops . . . . stoutly . . . . . fought the battle in Convocation against those very influences which the king was doing his best to foster; how they brought back the authorized teaching of the Church from the vagueness of the Ten Articles to a more and more clear enunciation of old principles. . . . Lollardy had certainly broken into the Church, unrecognized but powerful. . . . But Lollardy in the forms of Calvinism and Puritanism reasserted itself. . . . Opposite schools of thought were developed within the national Church. Yet truly Catholic principles were never lost sight of."[24]

Lollardy's radical appeal (finally rejected in its destructive elements) and the way Rome was regarded in England, may be seen by an interesting pre-Reformation incident in the course of which we are presented with documentary evidence of a character no good teacher will overlook. We are not concerned with many phases of this history, but simply with the expressed relationship of England with Rome, which shows a face not easily indentified with the average schoolroom teaching.

"In 1395 . . . . the Lollards presented to Parliament a petition for the reform of the Church, in which they expressed themselves with astonishing boldness. They set forth the decay of the Church, owing to its temporal grandeur and the consequent corruption of the clergy. The ordinary Roman priesthood, it set forth, is no longer the true

[24] Gairdner: *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, 1908, Vol. II., pp. 467, 468, 478, 479. And see forward, pp. 221 and 222.

> priesthood ordained by Christ; the pretended miracle of the Mass leads men to idolatry; the enforced celibacy of the clergy causes immoral living; the use of needless benedictions and exorcisms savours of necromancy rather than theology; prayers for the dead are merely means of gaining alms, etc. . . . Inasmuch as the Church of England has gone astray in these matters, following its step-mother, the Church of Rome, the petitioners pray for its reformation and restoration to primitive perfection." [25]

Still another pre-Reformation incident which must be thrown into the account in estimating reformation and continuity is this, brought out in recent history. It shows the relation of the crown to the Church of England, and it goes back to the eleventh century:

> "Between Hildebrand claiming in definite words that the head of the Church was the lord of the world, and William asserting in unmistakable acts that the king of England was over all persons in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, through his dominions supreme, there were certain to be differences of opinion. . . . In this matter, indeed, William was but maintaining prerogatives which he had inherited from his predecessors, and which were simultaneously being vindicated by the other princes of his time."
>
> "Such influence as the papacy exercised in Normandy before 1066 at least, was due much more to traditional reverence for the Holy See, and to occasional respect for the character of its individual occupants, than to any recognition of the legal sovereignty of the Pope in spiritual matters."
>
> "To all the greater movements which were agitating the religious life of the continent in the eleventh century—the Cluniac revival, the hierarchical claims of the papacy—the English Church as a whole remained serenely oblivious." [26]

Creighton says: "The movement against the Papacy had been of long standing in England. The English Church had never submitted unreservedly to Papal control. Papal encroachments had been guarded against, especially in

---

[25] Creighton: *History of the Papacy During the Period of the Reformation*, Vol. I. pp. 303 and 304. Compare Gee and Hardy: *Documents Illustrative*, p. 126.

[26] *William the Conqueror and the Rule of the Normans.* By Frank M. Stenton, M.A., Late Scholar of Keble College, Oxford: Putnams, 1908, in the series "Heroes of the Nations," edited by H. W. C. Davis, pp. 377, 378, and 387.

the reigns of Edward I. and Edward III., by stringent laws . . . . Henry forced his own position—the old church system without a Pope—upon all." Creighton sets an example in careful use of language in this way, but calls Mary's "the old religion": "Celebrating Mass according to Roman use," p. 29; and Elizabeth's "plan was to free the English Church from the beliefs and practices which had sprung up in it through its relations to Rome, without altering the Catholic foundation on which it rested." "Protestants and Catholics alike had to obey. The Church of England became a national Church," that is, included the entire population.[27]

Now what standing shall we assign Creighton as a historian? In his aim, fairness—truth—were so conspicuous and in his method entire independence was so pervading, that he has never, so far as I have seen, been accused of partiality. He so delighted in independence of position that in time it became a kind of recreation with him to shock the sensibilities and prejudices of the conservative reciters of worn phrases. He liked to force people to think for themselves, distrusting the utility of conventionality. These traits perhaps may be made clear to the reader by several extracts:

> "Theology has become historical and does not demand that history should become theological."
>
> "Ecclesiastical history must be pursued in exactly the same way and with exactly the same spirit as any other branch of history. The aim of the investigator is simply the discovery of truth . . . . in a spirit of absolutely free inquiry and entire independence of judgment."
>
> "We are tempted sometimes to speak of one Reformation as though it were the chief or the most notable one; but there are many reformations in the history of the Church which in their importance can at least come into comparison with that one which we are accustomed to call 'The Reformation.'"

The following extracts will contribute to our comprehension of the causes and spirit of the Reformation in the Church of England:

> "In 1232 Grosseteste had to put off his contemplated pilgrimage to Rome for fear of the ill feeling which existed

[27] Creighton: *The Age of Elizabeth*, chpt. 3, pp. 15, 16, 29, 46, and 49.

in Rome against the English, in consequence of their ill treatment of Roman priests resident in England. The fact was that the encroachment and extortions of the Papacy had reached such a pitch that at length an association was formed of 'those who would rather die than be confounded by the Romans.' That was the real title of the society. It was a secret body, composed mostly of landowners who had resolved no longer to endure the exactions of the Pope. They wrote a circular letter to all the Bishops and chapters in the country recounting the evils that arose from the preferment of so many foreign ecclesiastics in England, and ended by saying, 'a man who kindly wipes our noses draws blood.'"

After telling the story of the triumphs of Presbyterianism and Independency, and of the efforts at combination, Creighton says:

"Where England again had to consider the matter, nothing was vital except the system—which was practically accepted at the Restoration. . . . The Church of England was part of the Catholic Church, holding the Catholic faith, maintaining the historic episcopacy, dispensing the sacraments according to primitive ordinance. 'I die,' said Laud in his will, 'I die as I have lived, in the true Orthodox profession of the Catholic faith of Christ, a true member of His Catholic Church, within the communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England.' This was the position of the English Church, and nothing subsequently altered it. Compromises might be urged by politicians, but nothing could be accepted which threatened to destroy the order of the English Church as part of the continuous Church of Christ."

"The peculiar character of the English Reformation tended to narrow English interests and to isolate English thought. When once the severance from the Roman Church had been accomplished, Englishmen did not care to look back upon centuries of decadence and corruption. Attention was almost exclusively given to the history of the primitive Church and the writings of the early fathers. From these alone were materials drawn for the controversy with Rome. The Bible and primitive antiquity were the foundations on which the English Church claimed to be built. It rejected the authority of the Bishops of Rome and passed over in disdain the period in which that authority had been recognized. . . . As against the Church of Rome, the Church of England insisted that what she had discarded was dis-

carded because it was without sufficient warrant of scripture or primitive usage." [28]

Other historians have said:

"The permanent threefold division of English religion into Churchman, Nonconformist, and Roman Catholic, begins in the reign of Elizabeth for all practical purposes, though she would have been the last to recognize the fact. To her, as to the Bishops, there was never more than one Church in England—the Church recognized and protected by the state, said the court; the Church of the ancient ministerial succession, said the High Churchmen." [29]

"We owe it to Cranmer that our Church remained a true branch of the Catholic Church." [30]

Section II. Some Dictionaries and Encyclopedias.

Haydn's *Dictionary of Dates and Universal Information,* twentieth edition, 1893 (Putnams), is an English book, written up to date by Benjamin Vincent, Librarian, etc., who holds title to a corresponding membership in the Historical Society of New York. This book uses the term Church of England, before, through, and after the Reformation; from A.D. 314 down to the present time.[31] There are no Protestant Episcopalians in this book, as English people would not be likely to look for this heading, but an equivalent is found in "Church of North America."

In the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* we cannot find any date for the foundation of the Church of England. The article "Church History" is from a Scotch Protestant point of view. The article "English History" asserts continuity (Vol. VIII.). The article "England, Religion" implies continuity of the Church through the Reformation adjustments in this wise: "The Established Church of England . . . was governed, at the end of 1877, by two Archbishops and twenty-eight Bishops. There were as many as twenty-one bishoprics

[28] Creighton: *Historical Lectures and Addresses,* pp. 2, 5 and 6, 69, 120 and 121, 185, 186, and 3. Cf. *The Church and the Nation,* 1901, pp. 78, 156, 173, 185, 186, 284, 285.

[29] *Social England:* A Record of the Progress of the People in Religion, Laws, Learning, etc., by various writers, edited by H. D. Traill, D.C.L., Sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, 1895; Vol. III., p. 308.

[30] Sir Clements R. Markham: *King Edward VI.: An Appreciation.* 1908, p. 129. Cf. Kennedy: *Archbishop Parker,* 1908, in the series, "Makers of National History," pp. viii, 1, 2, 11, 84, and 285.

[31] Haydn: as above, pp. 274-278 in the twenty-third edition, 1904.

at the beginning of the eighth century." In the article "England, Church of" we read:

> "Legally and historically continuous with the Church of the most ancient times, the Church of England has always had a national character. In mediæval acts of Parliament it was called by the same name as at present, and was never identical with the Church of Rome, which was usually described as the court (curia) of Rome. In the sixteenth century, by a series of measures passed by the three estates of the realm, its vassalage to Rome was broken off, since which time the Roman court has maintained a hostile attitude toward it. . . . It grounds itself on Holy Scripture and the three creeds. . . . It is Protestant, as agreeing with the protest made in Germany against the errors of Rome; and Catholic, as claiming to be a portion of the Universal Church of Christ. (25 Henry VIII., ch. XXI., par. 13; 1 Eliz., ch. I." The historical sketch begins with traditions of the times of St. Paul.

We have shown elsewhere that Professor Freeman wrote part of this article on *England,* and S. R. Gardiner the rest. The former wrote to 1603, and had £315 for the work. [32]

The New English Dictionary on Historical Principles quotes Baxter (1651) as saying: "I hope this learned man doth not take the particular Romane Church for the Catholick Church." [33] Under 1685 we are referred to Bishop Ken on the Church Catechism. Ken's passage is of great value. We therefore insert it here, though it belongs more properly in Chapter IX.:

> I believe, O blessed and adorable Mediator, that the Church is a society of persons, founded by Thy love to sinners,[6] united into one body, of which Thou art the head,[7] initiated by baptism,[8] nourished by the Eucharist,[9] governed by pastors commissioned by Thee, and endowed with the power of the keys,[10] professing the doctrine taught by

---

[32] Stephens: Freeman, Vol. II., pp. 125, 126. For a severe but just criticism on the article "Church History," see Headlam: *History, Authority, and Theology,* 1909, p. 271. Headlam gives also valuable references to Kurtz, Duchesne, the Reformation, and the Forged Decretals.

[33] Oxford and New York: Macmillans. Publication was begun in 1888. See Vol. II., 1893, p. 186, "Catholic" ii. and 5.

[6] Matt. xvi. 18; Eph. v. 25. [7] Col. i. 18. [8] Matt. xxviii. 19.
[9] Matt. xxvi. 26. [10] Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 22, 23.

Thee,[11] and delivered to the saints,[12] and devoted to praise and to love Thee.

I believe, O holy Jesus, that Thy Church is holy, like Thee its Author; holy, by the original design of its institution;[13] holy, by baptismal dedication; holy, in all its administrations, which tend to produce holiness;[14] and though there will be always a mixture of good and bad in it in this world,[15] yet it has always many real saints in it; and therefore, all love, all glory be to Thee.

I believe, Lord, this Church to be Catholic or universal, made up of the collection of all particular Churches; I believe it to be Catholic in respect of time, comprehending all ages to the world's end, to which it is to endure;[16] Catholic in respect of all places, out of which believers are to be gathered;[17] Catholic in respect of all saving faith, of which this creed contains the substance, which shall in it always be taught;[18] Catholic in respect of all graces, which shall in it be practised; and Catholic in respect of that Catholic war it is to wage against all of its ghostly enemies, for which it is called militant. O preserve me always a true member of Thy Catholic Church, that I may always inseparably adhere to Thee, that I may always devoutly praise and love Thee.

Glory be to Thee, O Lord my God, who hast made me a member of the particular Church of England, whose faith, and government, and worship are holy, and Catholic, and Apostolic, and free from the extremes of irreverence or superstition; and which I firmly believe to be a sound part of Thy Church universal, and which teaches me charity to those who dissent from me; and therefore, all love, all glory, be to Thee.

O my God, give me grace to continue steadfast in her bosom, to improve all those helps to true piety, all those means of grace, all those incentives of Thy love, Thou hast mercifully indulged me in her communion, that I may with primitive affections and fervour praise and love Thee.[34]

Returning to *The New English Dictionary;* the Holy Catholic Church is defined as:

"The Ancient Church, as it existed, undivided. . . .

---

[11] Acts ii. 41, 42. [12] Jude ver. 3. [13] II. Tim. i. 9.
[14] II. Tim. ii. 19. [15] Matt. xiii. 24.
[16] Matt. xvi. 18; xxviii. 20. [17] Matt. xxviii. 19. [18] John xvi. 13.

[34] Ken: *An Exposition of the Church Catechism,* in *Ken's Prose Works,* Anc. and Mod. Lib. of Theol. Lit., pp. 139 and 140. In Nov. 1909 the Rev. J. O. Coop of Liverpool discovered a book of 1677 (5th edition 1679), approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury, "issued and widely used almost immediately after the final revision of our Prayer Book," containing similar official teaching.

> After the separation [of East and West, the name is] assumed by the Western or Latin Church. . . . . After the Reformation it was claimed as its exclusive title by that part of the Western Church which remained under the Roman obedience; but held by Anglicans not to be so limited, but to include the Church of England as the proper continuation in England, alike of the Ancient and the Western Church." In 1670 Bishop Jeremy Taylor says: "The Catholic Church hath been too much and too soon divided . . . . but in things simply necessary, God hath preserved us still unbroken, and all nations and all ages recite the creed . . . and all Churches have been governed by Bishops." [35]
>
> *The New English Dictionary* says: "Roman Catholics is the designation known to English law."

This dictionary is inclusive and gives references showing altogether different usages.

The Dictionary of English History, [36] in the article on the Church, says: Henry VIII. "severed the union between the English and Roman Churches." The article assumes the English Church's continuity.

Nelson's Encyclopædia says, under "Church, Anglican": "For the parent body of the Anglican Church see *England, Church of";* and under that head the continuity is asserted, and it is added that the name does not date from the Reformation.

What's What: A Guide for To-day, to Life as it is and Things as They Are,[37] has this:

> "The Anglican Church: A most important branch of the Holy Catholic Church is the Anglican Church. . . . Christ founded a sole Church on earth, which man has divided, but not destroyed. The separation, in the eleventh century, of the Western from the Eastern Communion (regarded by a considerable section amongst Anglicans as the mother Church), was the first great cleavage. Over the Western Communion Rome held undoubted sway until the sixteenth century, when the Reformation in Europe gave birth to Protestantism. The Anglican Church founds her claim to continuity on triple grounds. . . . It has been more than once declared by the Anglican episcopate

[35] *New Engl. Dic. on Hist. Princ.*, Vol. II., p. 186, 6 and 7.
[36] Edited by Sidney J. Low, B.A., Late Scholar of Balliol, etc., and F. S. Pulling, late Professor of History, Yorkshire College, Leeds, 1884.
[37] By Henry Quilter, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge: Barrister At Law; 1902.

that no new Church was founded in England by the Reformation."

SECTION III. SPECIAL HISTORIES OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

We will first take the statement of FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE:

> "In the reign of Henry VIII. . . . a large body of the Bishops and clergy had been led by their religious feelings to desire that this correspondence with Rome should be broken off; to feel that the English Church could not maintain its own position unless it became strictly national; unless it abandoned that subjection to a foreign Bishop which the state had always wished it to abandon . . . . the Romanists have felt that the English Reformation was more fatal to the maxim upon which they were habitually acting, than the Reformation in any other quarter had been. There was a hope that men might renounce a new system of opinions and adopt an old one. But a Church which had affirmed the principle of nationality . . . . was . . . . utterly incorrigible. . . . . It was the feeling that the English Church was not founded upon the Calvinistic idea which gave occasion to the earliest Puritan movements." The final chapter argues that the English Church is exclusively *the* Catholic Church of the land.[38]

DEAN HOOK'S great historical work begins with Augustine, A. D. 597, and continues through the Reformation. The author declares his design to present "A History of the Church of England. The Church of England is a national institution which has existed from the time of Augustine to the present hour."[39] It is well known to all observers that the Archbishops of Canterbury succeeded in regular order during all the troubles of the Reformation. There was no break. The occupants might come and go; the office went on without ceasing.

No matter how little or how much he might sympathize with Rome, the Archbishop was the Archbishop until death vacated his office. Warham, of Henry VII., takes up the office in 1503 and dies late in 1532; Cranmer succeeds early

---

[39] Hook: *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, in eleven volumes, published 1860 to 1875.

[38] Maurice: *"The Kingdom of Christ; or, Hints to a Quaker Respecting . . . the Catholic Church.* By F. D. Maurice, M.A., Prof. of Eng. Lit. and Hist. in Kings' College, London, 2d ed., 1842, Vol. II., pp. 481-483.

in 1533, in Henry VIII.'s reign; he is burnt at the stake March 21, 1556. Pole, a deacon, is consecrated Bishop the 26th of March, 1556, and dies in 1558, twenty-two hours after his cousin, Queen Mary. Then the selection of a successor is made, and three times the office is declined. Meanwhile the nation is occupied with the accession and coronation of Elizabeth, and the difficulties of a new administration. It was three years before Parker succeeded. He succeeded to no new office, but became Archbishop of Canterbury, purposely and consciously and as a matter of course taking up the office held by his predecessors for nine and a half centuries. No one at the time questioned his succession. The bull of the Pope and the plots of the Papists were directed against Queen Elizabeth, and not against the Archbishop of Canterbury. Parker died in 1575. The Queen kept the revenues of the Archbishopric for herself for six months, when Grindal succeeded. There is no break at any time. It must be remembered that men are not consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, but they are consecrated Bishop, and any Bishop may thence enter the Archbishop's succession. It is of no consequence whether there be any ceremony, or what kind of a ceremony it may be, provided only that there may not be any consecration when the appointee is already a Bishop. It is this law which makes Archiepiscopal vacancies which may exist for a short or longer period of no effect upon the fact of succession, and we see one Archbishop of Canterbury succeed another "without a break." This is the fact which comes out so strongly in a work like Dean Hook's, or in the book of Miss Bevan's, referred to elsewhere.

We will pass rapidly over this earlier literature, taking only enough authorities to show the wide acceptance of the fact of continuity by men of all parties. They all accepted it because they all lived under it and in the face of it every day. The literature of continuity is immense; we cannot begin to give all that is important, but we can give much that is typical, and more that is modern. The object in expanding the most modern and recent expressions is to show that the theory of continuity is still held by living scholars

who have access to all that may be known on such a subject, and to show further that it is not time to say, as some do, that the theory of continuity is either untenable or increasingly unpopular.

Bringing up the teachers of continuity towards the present, we will resume with DIXON, who says:

> "A revolution was effected, first in property, then in religion, but none in polity, none in the ancient constitution of the Church of England. . . . This formal adherence to antiquity, this continued maintenance of the old constitution in all parts and branches, is the most characteristic and admirable feature of the English Reformation." [40]

J. H. BLUNT says:

> "While the Church of England is perfectly free from the jurisdiction of the Pope, and is 'a particular Church, having within itself all the elements of government and discipline, it has never forfeited its place in the unity of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church,' nor has it ever claimed to be spiritually separated from any other particular Church which continues therein."
>
> "The Reformers never for an instant professed to be abolishing the old Church of England and founding a new one." . . . . In "an Apostolically descended episcopate, a sacerdotal ministry, and valid sacraments . . . . the Church of England has always been conspicuously distinguished. . . . . In those three particulars the Reformed Church of England is as entirely identical with the pre-Reformation Church of England as a man who is at one time in sickness and at another in health is the same man, or as a vine which has been pruned is the same vine that it was before it was pruned."
>
> "Reformation principles . . . . consist chiefly in the maintenance of independence on the one hand and Catholic character on the other. The Church of England has never disowned its ancient lineage nor separated itself from other branches of the Catholic Church. . . . The most difficult times and circumstances have not deprived it of an episcopate as clearly descended from the Apostles as that of any Church in Christendom. . . . A real priesthood was carefully defended, and carefully handed on to future generations. . . . In its doctrinal system there has been no deviation from Catholic truth."

---

[40] Dixon: *History of the Church of England, from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction,* 1878. Vol. I., p. 6.

"While some of the adjuncts of the Reformation movement can only be regarded with regret and pain, the movement itself was substantially carried out on Catholic and constitutional principles, and . . . . may be regarded on the whole with satisfaction, if not pride."

"The Church of England has had a continuous and never ceasing vitality in every stage of its ancient and modern existence. . . . The idea that it was the foundation of a new Church, or that it was intended to be so by the reformers, is wholly unjustified by history." [41]

The title page of the Sarum Breviary, which we need hardly explain was a pre-Reformation service book, bore (in Latin) the name *Church of England* without either the word Catholic or the word Roman. The preface to the English Prayer Book, written by Bishop Sanderson in 1662, declares its intention to agree with Catholic teaching. The same thought occurs in Cranmer's preface of 1559, when he appeals to "the mind and purpose of the old fathers."

"The Book of Common Prayer was framed out of the ancient offices of the Church of England, by consolidation and translation of the latter, the same principles . . . . being also extended to the Communion service."

"The new book was, substantially, as it still remains, a condensed reproduction, in English, of those service books which had been used in Latin by the Church of England for many centuries before." [42]

"About nine-tenths of what is contained in the Prayer Book of 1549 came from the old Latin service books of the Church of England."

"Cranmer offered to prove that the order of the Church of England, set out by authority of Edward VI., was the same that had been used in the Church for fifteen hundred years past."

The English Reformation "had been strictly Catholic in its origin and in its official progress." [43]

Another says:

"During a period of more than twelve hundred years the Church of England has preserved its identity, and during that time England has advanced from a group of small and divided kingdoms into a vast empire, on which the sun

[41] Blunt: *The Reformation of the Church of England,* Vol. II., pp. 586-7, 602, 605, 2 and 3.

[42] Blunt: *Annotated Book of Common Prayer,* American edition, pp. 15 (note 2), 96, 98, 102, 17, 16.

[43] The same: p. 19.

never sets, in every quarter of the globe; and love for their country demands from Englishmen a love for their Church. . . . The truth is that there never was a Roman Church (properly or legally so styled) in England; that no new Church was made and endowed at the Reformation, but only that the old Church was, as the word implies, *reformed.* . . . . misstatements can be disposed of, and disposed of only, by an appeal to history. . . . The author neither holds nor would accept any preferment in the Church, so that he cannot on that ground be accused of personal or interested motives. His only desire is that the truth may be known." [44]

In Chapter VI. of the second volume, this historian goes back into the earliest history of the English Church with its foundation by Augustine in 597.

There is a valuable little book on *The English Reformation* by A. Theodore Wirgman, M.A., D.C.L., republished in this country about 1890. It tells its story well in less than a hundred pages. It is the work of an advocate—an advocate for the Catholic Anglican position. But not all advocates are in the wrong—and the book is mostly without bitterness. Let us take a few lines:

"The Reformation in England was an ecclesiastical restoration. Its result was a pruning of religious novelties, and a return to primitive and Catholic doctrine. It was an orderly and somewhat tedious movement, which began in 1531, and did not find a final settlement till 1662. It was conducted in strict accordance with ancient precedents, and its general aim was to free the ancient Catholic and national Church of England from certain abuses by a return to Catholic and Apostolic order. . . . The English reformers did not search for new truths, or destroy the ancient Catholic Church of the land. They did not overthrow the Threefold Apostolic Ministry of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, but took the utmost pains to preserve legally the Apostolic succession of the English Church, and to maintain the absolute historical identity of the Church of Cranmer, Parker, Laud, and Sancroft with the Church of St. Augustine, Theodore of Tarsus, Lanfranc, Anselm, and Langton. . . . The English Church of today is the same Church first planted in England . . . as the British Church; then strengthened by St. Augustine's Mission; consolidated by Archbishop Theodore of Tarsus as the Anglo-

[44] Hore: *The Church in England from William III. to Victoria.* By Rev. A. H. Hore, of Trinity College, Oxford (1886) (preface p. iv.).

Saxon Church; then dignified by the learning of Lanfranc and Anselm, and the courage of Thomas à Becket as the Anglo-Norman Church; then strengthened in sturdy independence by such a man as Grostete, Bishop of Lincoln, and by the hero of *Magna Charta,* Archbishop Langton, who as Primate of all England showed the craven tyrant John how an English Archbishop could despise a Papal censure, until the time was matured for a final severance from Rome. . . . . In answering the well worn Romish taunt, 'Henry made your Church,' we may aptly reply that Henry VIII. no more made the Church of England than a clumsy stonemason who hacked the arm off an antique statue could be said to have made the statue."

"We owe to Laud that the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, enshrined as it is in our articles and formularies, did not perish. . . . 'The altar,' were his words, 'is the greatest place of God's residence upon earth; greater than the pulpit, for there 'tis *Hoc est Corpus meum*—This is My Body; but in the other it is at most, *Hoc est Verbum meum* —This is My Word.'"

"The Reformation, despite its blunders and crimes, has yet left our Church Catholic, Primitive, and Apostolic, and its historical continuity has been maintained from the Apostolic age to the present day."[45]

Aubrey L. Moore says:

"In the Church of England the form which the Reformation took was so different from the continental form, that, while accepting in the main the Protestant view of the Reformation, the English Church approaches it in a much more conservative spirit. The rejection of the Roman jurisdiction on the grounds of the ancient rights of the English Church was the prominent feature . . . . the Reformation was the reassertion of the ancient independence of the English National Church . . . . and that with the rejection of interference from any foreign person whatsoever, the reforms so often attempted were made possible."[46]

These lectures are from a philosophical and scientific point of view. The volume presents a very large bibliography.

[45] Wirgman: *The English Reformation and the Book of Common Prayer,* pp. 7, 90, and 97.

[46] Moore: *Lectures and Papers* by the deputy Regius Prof. of Ecc. Hist., Oxford, 1880-1890, pp. 5 and 6.

G. G. Perry says:

> "In this little volume an attempt is made to give a clear and connected account of the religious and ecclesiastical changes through which the Church of England passed in the sixteenth century. . . . My endeavour has been to keep steadily in view the progress of the National Church from its state of bondage to Rome, and its encumbrance with many superstitious doctrines and practices, to the commencement of a higher life, the acquisition of Catholic and scriptural formularies, and the enjoyment of greater freedom. . . . The Reformation was a great religious crisis in the life of the Church, and seems to demand a special treatment . . . . to remove the delusion, still too widely spread, that the Church of England is a body which was called into existence by some act of Parliament . . . We may here see the National Church . . . . slowly and painfully shaking herself free from the obstructions which had long vexed her, and at length reaching a region of purer light." Analyzed, the volume treats the causes of the Reformation, religious, political, social; the character of the English Reformation; the national rights of the Church of England, the processes of Reformation, and a final chapter on "The Defence of the Reformation." [47]

Lord Acton says of Creighton that he possessed "the merits of moderation and sobriety." "Religious differences do not tinge his judgment." "Mr. Creighton is able to be considerate and appreciative both to Popes and Reformers." [48] Creighton says:

"A moment's thought will show us that it is not Henry VIII.'s action which is on its trial, but the state of things." He then gives what is I think the clearest existing explanation of dispensations, and one of the best of passages showing why Henry VIII. expected a dispensation owing to Rome's loose administration of the laws of matrimony in his own time and in his own family. Creighton is an authority who can be cited as teaching the unity and continuity and Catholic character of the Church of England, setting aside the theory of a break at the Reformation.[49]

---

[47] Perry: *History of the Reformation in England,* in the series "Epochs of Church History," edited by Creighton, 6th edition, 1898, pp. 1 and 2. Cf. 7th ed., 1903, pp. v, 1, 7, 8, 208, 131, 201.

[48] Acton: *Historical Essays and Studies,* pp. 426, 435, and 436.

[49] Creighton: *The Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction,* 1899, pp. 7, 20-27.

J. H. Maude says:

"The king [Henry VIII.] was exceedingly cautious in introducing changes which affected the religious faith and practices of the people. In repudiating the authority of the Pope, he had on the whole the sympathy of the nation; in destroying the monasteries he was aided by the jealousy of the secular clergy and the greed of his courtiers . . . . he either did not wish or did not venture to tamper to any great extent with the religion of daily life. Still some steps were taken which show that conservative and cautious reforms of the service books were in contemplation, and particularly that the use of the English language, the elimination of abuses, and the application of the test of antiquity were intended."

In 1549 "the main objects which the revisers kept in view, as may be gathered from the preface and contents of the new book, were the following: First, a return to *scripture and primitive usage*. In the Mass the order and contents of the Sarum service were adhered to, but stress was laid upon the communion of the people . . . . and the Canon was practically rewritten, expressions being omitted which might be thought to countenance the doctrine of a repetition of the Sacrifice of the Cross, and the then prevalent form of doctrine of Transubstantiation."

In 1549 "no primitive or Catholic element was omitted, the Catholic doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice were unmistakably taught."

In 1552 "nothing essential had been omitted . . . . nothing had been introduced which was in any way inconsistent with Catholic doctrine . . . . the revisers emphatically disclaimed the intention of making any important changes, and spoke of the earlier form in the highest possible terms."

In 1559 "the use of Eucharistic vestments is again ordered, and the ancient form of administration restored."

In 1661 we have "the restoration of an explicit oblation of the elements at the offertory" and insertion of words "to sanction the doctrine of the Real Presence." This is explained to be on account of an unauthorized and unacceptable attack upon the Real Presence made by the former government influences, but not adopted by the Church.

This short summary of the changes of 112 years of Reformation will show the essential conservation of the Catholic features.

In 1661 we have the plainest incidental indication that the old orders of the ministry were actually retained. "The words 'Bishops, Pastors, and Ministers of the Church' were changed to 'Bishops, Priests, and Deacons' where the prayer for them is offered in the Litany.

"It is quite beyond the scope of this work to describe the circumstances which caused the Reformation movement to take in Scotland a course so different from that which it assumed in England. It must suffice to say that in the sixteenth century all ancient forms of devotion were swept away, together with the historical continuity of the Church." [50]

Wakeman says:

The act of uniformity of 1549, which some have taken as the foundation or establishment, some as the re-foundation or reëstablishment, of the English Church

> "opens a new chapter in English Church history, which corresponds with a new wave of thought which was passing over the whole of the Western Church." "The publication of the Prayer Book of 1549 was probably the most important event which had taken place in the English Church since the Synod of Whitby" (A. D. 664). "The book . . . . was instinct with the spirit of the Catholic Church." "Mary Tudor was the first Roman sovereign of England." He speaks of "the position of the English Church in its double character as Catholic and anti-Papal, in its double appeal to Scripture and to history"; of the "identity of interests between the English Church and the Orthodox Churches of the East in the controversy with Rome," both of these principles being recognized by Laud (beheaded, 1645) who "was willing to allow the Church of Rome to be a part of the Church Catholic, though not the whole of it." "The Church of England is reformed because it has purged itself of mediæval abuses, restored the Bible to its proper place in the religious life of the Church, adopted vernacular services, declined to recognize the claim of the Pope to be Universal Bishop. But . . . . she is essentially Catholic in the fulness of historical right and regained practice." [51]

---

[50] J. H. Maude: *The History of the Book of Common Prayer.* 2d edition, 1900. Pp. 2, 3, 7, 37, 39, 45, and 121.

[51] Wakeman: *An Introduction to the History of the Church of England* from the earliest times to the present day, 1899, pp. 273, 274, 281, 301, 364, 493. The volume is dedicated to the memory of Aubrey L. Moore. See also *The Church and the Puritans,* 6th ed., 1902, pp. v, 8, 86, 97, 198.

Wakeman gives the teaching of the Real Presence from Bishop Ridley (1555), Bishop Guest (1566), Archbishop Laud (1626), Bishop Andrewes (1610). Here are simply a couple of pages illustrating the principle worked out in full in the *Tracts for the Times,* proving the old teaching was not broken off; a fact which needs both illustrating and working out, as so many American writers appear to be entirely ignorant of it.

We have called attention elsewhere to the fact that this history, by far the best in its special line, is not even mentioned in the A. L. A. catalogue. Yet it is an essential to every library willing to show both sides of a question. Wakeman is not one-sided; he is sympathetic and constructive, not partisan. J. Henry Shorthouse, author of *John Inglesant,* a member of the Society of Friends up to the age of 27 years, when he joined the Church of England, writes thus of Wakeman's History:

> "I have been excessively taken with the *History of the Church of England,* by Mr. Offley Wakeman. I wish every man, woman, and child in England would read it. It is a perfectly marvellous book in its charm of expression, its exhaustive breadth of view, its fairness, its condensed information—in fact everything else that can be said in praise of a book."[52]

The Reformation in Great Britain, by H. O. Wakeman and the Rev. Leighton Pullan, M.A., says:

> "The powers of government which the Pope claimed to have in virtue of his office as Pope over the English Church were taken away from him, and the position was definitely taken up that the powers of government which the Pope had been in the habit of exercising during the last few hundred years had been exercised by virtue of arrangement with the English Church and license from the English crown, and not in virtue of prerogative inherent in the Papal office. . . . That position was most clearly laid down in the preamble to the Statute in Restraint of Appeals; it is the master thread which runs through all the ecclesiastical legislation of these momentous years."[53]

James Gairdner, Esq., C.B., LL.D., is the writer on the period from the accession of Henry VIII. to the death of

[52] Shorthouse: *Life and Letters,* edited by his wife, 1905, Vol. I., p. 340.
[53] 1905: p. 19.

Mary in *A History of the English Church,* a series of eight volumes edited by Dean Stephens and written mostly by eminent priest scholars of the mother Church. The names are not obscure; among them are Frere, Hutton, and Overton. In this series there is no trace of a founder of the Church of England after St. Augustine in 597. Now and then Gairdner lets himself look at the English Church through the eyes of a Philip or a Mary, and half quoting, or rather making use of an indirect discourse much more common amongst the English than ourselves, he calls it the heresy; Rome the true religion or the Catholic. In most places he is clear on the Catholicism and continuity of the English Church. The period of which he writes is "a period of transition in the history of the English Church" . . . "The unity of the Church was . . . . a doctrine which the state felt bound to uphold . . . . But this did not affect the old belief, held even by reformers, in the one true Catholic and Apostolic Church. A supreme spiritual jurisdiction at Rome was not felt to be vitally necessary." This position he admirably illustrates by giving the incident and words of John Rogers before the Chancellor. For a time the Mass meant the sacrament without communions by the people, communions without the chalice, the service in Latin, and there was some allegation of theory that the Eucharist repeated or substituted Christ's offering of Himself upon the Cross. It was these things—now seen as (not one of them) essentials to the sacrament—that made men say the Mass was illegal. But the sacrament itself, and in fact the Mass, was made to take a form which was legal and unobjectionable; and room was made for the idea that the offering in the Eucharist was a re-presentation, a representation, and a memorialization before the Father of the once finished offering upon the Cross. Knowing as we now do what are the real essentials of the Mass and sacrament, it is evident that men of long ago were needlessly angry over theories which were of little authority, and if left alone would have created very little difference. Gairdner is not always at pains to make himself clear, and perhaps for his English readers there may be small need of careful definitions. But

the great trials of the historian as he moves in and out among the American schools and libraries and tests the knowledge of the average American citizen are proof conclusive that the one thing required in this country for any understanding of the English Reformation and English religion is a full and sharp definition of terms, and their habitual use in an exact and defined meaning. Even American religion can hardly be understood without it, and yet it is a discipline difficult for the American mind. It seems to the writer that two of the active movements amongst the American religio-philosophical communities—the Unitarians and the Eddyites—have given the weight of their influence to upset the balance of scientific exactness in religious terminology. If this is so, they have simply prevented thinking in the religious sphere, and delayed the progress of minds to the conclusions with which sound and accurate thinking has a right to expect to be rewarded. How much, then, can we Americans thank an English writer who has his conclusions and yet leaves his readers unable to discover what they are?[54] For this historian confesses that he has written without earnestness and apparently as if he were "on the fence" in the matter of the foundation or continuity of the Church of England. Yet he has recently cleared up the matter for his readers. The following is taken from the London *Church Times* of January 12, 1906:

"The well-known historian of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Dr. James Gairdner, C.B., author of *A History of the English Church in the Sixteenth Century, from Henry VIII. to Mary,* having been asked by a correspondent how far he considered the claim of the Church of England to continuity with the pre-Reformation Church to be historically justifiable, replied:

> "The question you ask me is a very pregnant one and I cannot affect to be surprised that persons of different persuasions have found, or thought they have found, exactly opposite answers to it in my book. As regards the continuity of the Church of England, I would observe that it

[54] Gairdner: as above, 1903, pp. ix, x, 310, 321, 334, 350, 367. Cf. the vol. named below, 1902, p. x, for a clear statement of Continuity and Catholicity.

is a simple question of fact or no fact. If the Church of England is not the same Church now that she was before the Reformation, at what precise date did the loss of identity take place? There is an exact hour or half hour at which St. Michael's Mount is cut off from the land in Cornwall at every tide, and there is no difficulty in telling the time when it becomes or ceases to be an island. So also, if there was any breach of the continuity in the Church of England, there must have been a precise year in which it took place. What was that year? Is it in the power of tyranny to create a new Church or take the whole life out of an old one? I do not think so, for my part. If the country still contained a community of Christians, that is to say, of real believers in the great gospel of salvation—men who still accepted the old creeds and had no doubt Christ died to save them—then the Church of England still remained the same Church as before. The new order under which it was placed did not affect its identity. A good deal even of the old system was preserved—in fact, all that was really essential to it; and as regards the doctrine, nothing was taken away except some doubtful scholastic propositions. I think this is all that need be said to vindicate the truth of the continuity of the Church of England." In *Lollardy and the Reformation in England* (1908), Dr. Gairdner again speaks in the obscure way which he here repudiates, and his closing lines in this book are a fine testimony to the evidential value of continuous human conviction or belief. As to the motive for the Reformation, he says "the defaming of the monasteries was simply a step towards their suppression and the confiscation of their endowments." Dr. Gairdner is said to be "an historian saturated with the very essence of original documents" (*Church Times,* 6 Nov. 1908). He has written on the Creed of the English Church as lately as in the *Guardian* of Sept. 1 and Dec. 1, 1909, the argument advancing from an accepted position in favor of Catholicity and continuity.

W. H. Hutton says:

"The seventeenth century was a time of crisis, as serious as the Reformation, in the history of the English Church . . . . With the reign of Charles I. began the decisive struggle which was to fix the limits of the Reformation, and to determine whether the English Church should maintain the principles of doctrine and order enunciated in . . . . her Book of Common Prayer and her Ordinal. The divergence between historic, traditional Christianity, with its creeds and its episcopal system, and the new dogmas and

disciplines which had been elaborated in Germany and Switzerland." . . . Charles I., morally one of the best of kings, though he did not understand the value or necessity of completer liberty in citizenship, and Laud, the Archbishop, both wrote for the Catholic continuity of the English Church. Laud brings forward the parallel case of the Greek Church as a permanent witness against the exclusive claim of Rome. "They [the Greeks] continue a true Church in the main substance to and at this day." It is worth while to reprint Hutton's analysis of Laud's argument: "There were errors in faith into which Rome had fallen which made it necessary for the Church of England to reform herself. This she did without departing from the Catholic faith once for all delivered to the Saints. And she did not depart from the essential unity of which that faith is the bond, or from the Apostolic discipline and ministry which preserve it. Thus Rome is a true Church, though erring—yet not *the* true Church. England also is a true Church. Errors there were in the reformers, as there were in the Popes; and the work of reformation is admittedly a most difficult one. And yet, through it all, the essence has been preserved, and the English protested against nothing but the errors of the Roman Communion. . . . . The English separation is not from the 'General Church,' but from the Church of Rome."

"But all the while ecclesiastical writers upheld the traditional views of the Church's position, not only in relation to the English crown, but in regard to the larger, universal body of which the Church formed a part. Thus the preface of the Prayer Book, written in 1662, speaks explicitly of the whole Catholic Church of Christ as having claims to the obedience of Englishmen. It was but following the teaching of Laud and of Hammond, who at the very crisis of the Civil War . . . . in 1644, urged not only obedience in every particular or national Church, but faithfulness within the fold of the Church Universal . . . . Bramhall . . . . in 1654, asserted the essential unity of the Catholic Church, and Thorndike, just before the Reformation, declared his obligation to the whole Church as well as to the Church of England." [55]

This writer is unusually well equipped, after years of specialized study and writing, to speak upon the Reformation. In 1904 he read a striking paper before a small club

[55] Hutton: *A History of the English Church From the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Anne.* By W. H. Hutton. A deeply interesting and illuminating treatment. Pp. 1, 11, 13, 14, 289.

in Oxford, the *Guardian* reprinted it, and later it was issued in pamphlet form. I will make a large extract from this paper.

> I cannot but feel that it would be helpful to many of us to have a clear impression of what the Reformation was. I venture, therefore, to offer a contribution to the discussion on the Reformation in the form of such conclusions as I have drawn from the study I have given to the subject. I offer the conclusions simply as mine, such as I have now reached. But so far as I know, so far as I have gone, they are what I believe to be solid results. I will not now quote the evidence for any of them; I will only say that I believe that there is sufficient evidence for them all. Several of these conclusions are those that we have all arrived at long ago, they are even what people nowadays call "obvious"; but I am inclined to believe that what is "obvious" is not always fully understood. I restate those conclusions which I personally believe to be sound, and I do not in any way lay claim to speak with authority.
>
> A. The Nature of the English Reformation.
>
> 1. The English Reformation differed not a little from any other reformation. The movements which affected other lands were of two classes. Either (*a*) as in Spain, they involved no breach with Rome, though a thorough readjustment of the relations between Church and State, and a complete reform of the monasteries, took place. This was because Rome treated, as she always has treated, different countries quite differently—I cannot find that there has ever been an invariable rule for dealing with questions, moral or religious or political, by the Roman Curia. Or (*b*) other countries affected by the reforming movement adopted an entirely new system, as in Scotland, where the whole political and constitutional history that led up to the Reformation, and the whole ecclesiastical history of the time, were utterly unlike the history of England.
>
> 2. We must observe that the English Reformation was spread over nearly two hundred years. It lasted practically from about 1485 to 1662. Under Henry VII. all the causes which led to our Reformation, and all the causes but one that led to a breach with Rome, were in existence, and in one of its chief aspects, the dissolution of the monasteries, the Reformation actually began. Under Henry VIII. and Edward VI. the Royal Supremacy as a constitutional doctrine was re-defined, and the clergy were formally allowed to marry, and the laity were given forms of public worship

in English. Under Mary all that had been done was undone, save in two significant points. A Romanist Queen ratified the confiscation of the monastic lands and retained a part of the special powers of Supremacy which had been asserted by her anti-Papal parent. Elizabeth's reign, if we must be particular, is the real era of the Reformation settlement, and that for two reasons—because the work of Henry and Edward and Mary was superseded or overlaid, and hers was not, and because then the definite final breach with Rome occurred. Under James I. and Charles I. the theological principles of the Elizabethan settlement were formally stated; at the Restoration the settlement embodied in the Prayer Book and in the Articles took its final shape.

3. The so-called divorce question had, I believe, very much less to do with the Reformation than has been supposed. Of course it irritated a masterful king, and not unnaturally. It brought people face to face with the question of the authority of the Papacy, with the inevitable result. What Henry asked was small in comparison with what Popes had granted of quite recent years. And for his own action there was a curious parallel in France some centuries before. Philip Augustus was married by Papal dispensation; his marriage was declared null by French Bishops, who married him to another woman, in spite of Papal protest, his wife still surviving. When after several years he retired from this second marriage and returned to his first wife, the children of his second marriage were declared legitimate by the Pope. Henry VIII. would certainly have been quite content had he experienced the same treatment. But the "divorce" was not important in the English Reformation movement. All it did was to irritate Henry VIII. and to irritate the English people more than ever against Rome, and to show the utter corruption of the Roman Curia. This is quite plain from the dreary volumes of unsavoury letters and pamphlets which record every phase of the case, and through which I have been wearily wading.

4. Following on this comes the conclusion that the Reformation was inevitable. Nothing could have stopped it. Making it certain to come were—(*a*) The feeling of the people. This is overwhelmingly borne in on one as one reads, as I have recently been doing, the literature of the fifteenth century—not only Wyclif, earlier, but Gascoigne, and Pecock, and the Paston letters. And besides that, the most pious lay sons of the Church saw that it must come —More, and the scholars at Oxford and Cambridge who introduced Greek. (*b*) The influence of the Renaissance. This was felt much more widely and more strongly than is gen-

erally recognized, in the direction of Latitudinarianism. (*c*) The condition of the monasteries and of the mendicant orders. I think we have all been led a little too far in the reaction against the old fashioned outcry against the monks. It is quite impossible to read, say, the letter of Archbishop Morton to the Abbot of St. Albans, or the Visitations of the diocese of Norwich and the Chapter of Southwell, without seeing that there was a very low standard, and not a little terrible sin, among the monasteries. What serious religious men—and the Bishops chief among them—felt about the need for a wholesale reform, if not dissolution, of the monasteries was felt by everybody from the days of Chaucer and Wyclif about the friars. These three causes made a reformation absolutely inevitable; and, in fact, a reformation was already in progress long before the divorce question appeared. With the strong popular feeling against Rome (I may again refer to absolutely unprejudiced witnesses—Gascoigne and the Paston letters) separation was practically certain.

5. We must not forget or minimize the influence on our Reformation of what may be most conveniently, though not accurately, called Protestantism. I mean the distinct effect of the principles of English anti-Catholic writers; and this not merely through Cranmer or the ragged crew who tried to man the ship under Edward VI., but through the writings of Wyclif and of others who after him had arrived at a distinctly Protestant position. I will give one instance: It is impossible to read the Latin works of Wyclif, which are now gradually becoming accessible, without seeing that the English Reformers must have studied them. What set the Reformers on that question, which they say comes from St. Augustine, in Article XXIX? I think probably Wyclif's treatise *De Eucharistiâ*, where he quotes the same passage to the same purpose. Where did the Black Rubric come from? It bears a striking resemblance to a passage in the same book.

B. The Results of the English Reformation.

After these preliminary points I think I may say briefly that the following conclusions emerge from the whole history of the changes:

1. The continuity of the Church was not broken. This is hardly such a truism as we have been lately accustomed to think. But nevertheless it is a solid fact. Legally, historically, theologically, I regard it as quite certain that we can hold this position.

2. The English Church did not separate from the unity

of Christ's Holy Catholic Church. Every single act of repudiation of Roman supremacy safeguards this position. Those in authority in the Church *never* intended to break from the Christian unity, but only to repudiate the claims of the Pope.

3. The language of our formularies is precise. It must be taken (as the Declaration prefixed to the Articles says) in the literal and grammatical sense. What was written was intended to be written. In the Articles the framers meant "sacrifices of Masses" when they wrote those words, and not "the sacrifice of the Mass"; the preface to the Ordinal means what it says—that the orders of ministers existing from the Apostles' time are to "be continued, and reverently used, and esteemed."

4. The leaders of the Reformation in England, if we take an extended view of them all—if we include in different ways all those who led, from 1485 to 1662—are seen to have had an ideal, and it was that which the English Reformation was intended to embody. What they did care for was to be primitive. Their ideal was the restoration of the primitive Church. They did not knowingly reject anything primitive, or admit anything that was not primitive. There are possible exceptions to this. But what is the real burden of all their writings is the appeal to Holy Scripture, to antiquity, to the early Church, the Fathers, the first councils, undivided Christendom.

I cannot conclude better than by quoting from the impressive and luminous address of the Bishop of London on "the position of the Church of England," some words which express better than I could express it the opinion which I had set down. "The problem set before the leaders of our Church in the sixteenth century," says the Bishop, "was to disentangle essential truth from the mass of opinion which had gathered around it." And, he adds, "the Church of England refers to the 'decent order of the ancient Fathers'; that is to say, the methods of the primitive Church." His conclusion bears so markedly upon the object with which I have written my paper that I beg leave to be allowed again to use his words:

"The great danger of the present day is lest the aspirations of the highest minds, profoundly Christian and profoundly moral, should desert all ecclesiastical systems because they are stereotyped by the remnants of ancient controversies and present suspicions, because they are unable to move freely and face the real work which they are called upon to do. This danger is intensified by ignoble struggles about matters of detail, conducted without reference to

great principles. This gradual alienation of thoughtful minds from the Church has occurred in other countries with lamentable results to the national life. We of the Church of England are still in close touch with the vigorous life of a great people. It behooves us to realize the greatness of our opportunity, and to work together in the cause of God's truth on the basis of a frank and loyal acceptance of those principles which . . . guided our forefathers in the past, and have lost none of their ancient virtue." [56]

Professor (now Bishop) Collins wrote:

"It ought hardly to be necessary to say anything about the ignorant assertion that at the Reformation a Roman Catholic Church was abolished and a Protestant Church set up in its stead. . . . . Still, old falsehoods die hard, especially when, like this, they have been repeated and repeated till they have become commonplaces. And as this assertion has been made, and still is, by those who ought to know better, a word must be said about it. If, then, the old Church ceased to exist, and a new one was made, let our opponents say when this was done, and let them produce something in the nature of evidence of the fact. Needless to say, they have no evidence whatever to produce; they do not agree, and never have, as to when it took place. . . . . Meanwhile, we affirm that there is no Church in Christendom which has so unbroken a history as we have." He then compares the disasters which have befallen the Churches of Spain, Rome, and France.[57]

"Our Reformation was not made in Germany, and was thoroughly English from the first; its motive power and its direction alike came from within, not from without."

"Without in any way thinking that everything was done perfectly, we contend that our principle of *appeal to Holy Scripture and Catholic tradition* is the right one, and that in the main it was faithfully carried out. . . . In spite of the turbulence and license inseparable from such a period of crisis, *there was nothing like a breach of continuity;* the Church which existed before the Reformation continued unchanged after it. There was no interference with our Apostolic Ministry. No new creed was made, and no creed of the Catholic Church was rejected or tampered with. Such practical changes as were made were in the di-

[56] Hutton: *The English Reformation*, pp. 3 to 15, Church Historical Society reprint, 1904; compare his *Elementary Church History of Great Britain*, and *A Short History of the Church in Great Britain*, 1900.

[57] Collins: *The English Reformation and its Consequences*, p. 34.

rection of a return to Catholic practice. In a word, as Archbishop Bramhall (died 1663) has said: 'I make not the least doubt in the world that the Church of England before the Reformation and the Church of England after the Reformation are as much the same Church as a garden, before it is weeded and after it is weeded, is the same garden; or a vine, before it be pruned and after it is pruned and freed from the luxuriant branches, is one and the same vine.'"

It is Professor Collins who warns us of the fatal danger of trying to "make up" history for a plea; for in the end, only fairness pays, and truth; he speaks of

"the Nemesis which, sooner or later, must overtake those who have been making use, however unintentionally, of a false argument. It ought hardly to be necessary to point out that such considerations should have no weight whatever with followers of Him who is the Truth. . . . It is not our primary business to make a scientific frontier for ourselves, or to take up a good fighting position against opponents, but to prove all things and hold fast that which is good. Of course, the natural man loves a *prescriptio,* an argument which puts his opponents out of court altogether . . . . ; but sooner or later it will always appear that such an argument involves the surrender of one side or the other of the truth, a thing which the Catholic Christian dare not make; and the method in itself is, as Frederick Denison Maurice said, an outrage upon the truth."

Bishop Gore says:

"We find ourselves by our baptism members of a Church which claims to be part of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and which, at the same time, has become separated from the rest of Western Christendom by a refusal to submit to the claims of the See of Rome." "We do not find on examination that we fail to comply with any of the conditions of Catholic communion which the ancient and undivided Church recognized." "Nothing occurred in the English Reformation which broke the continuity of our Church in any essential matter with the Church of the past." "Just in proportion as the Anglican Church has been content to act as if she were Catholic, and to stir up the gifts within her, in that proportion we find she is so and has the living Spirit in her body." [58]

[58] Gore: *Roman Catholic Claims,* 10th edition, 1906, pp. 16, 17, 18. Compare *The New Theology and the Old Religion,* 1907, p. 160, and *Orders and Unity,* 1909, pp. 4, 174, 181, 199.

Dr. G. F. Browne, Bishop of Bristol, says:

"We of the English Church were founded about the year 600 A.D., by Gregory, the Bishop of Rome. He founded the Church of England. He never called it anything else. 'The Church of the English,' 'the English Church,' these are the only names he ever called it. He speaks of us as quite as much a Church as the Roman. When he speaks of his own Church (only once to Augustine), he said *Ecclesia Romana*, the Roman Church, and in the same letter he said *English Church*. There is no assumption of the supremacy of the one over the other. . . . He clearly acted so that when once set going we could keep ourselves going. He sent us a Bishop. He did not consecrate him himself. When the Gallican Bishops consecrated him, Gregory told him how to increase the episcopate in England, and how, when he had increased it to a certain number, it was to go on forever. . . . . When the vacancy occurred, the Bishops were to elect a successor and consecrate him. He never said, you must ask Rome about the person you elect, and whether you may go on electing an Archbishop and consecrating him. No; but he started the Church of England on such conditions, and with such regulations, as would carry it on forever without a single communication ever taking place of necessity between the English and the Roman Churches. That was the foundation which Gregory gave to the English Church." At the Reformation "there was not any idea of a new Church; there was no such thing." "This fact stands out on the page of history, past and present, that the Church of England to-day is, as the Church of England always has been, continuously, completely, and exhaustively, the Catholic Church in England." [59]

"The Church of England never was a part of the Church of Rome, and the period during which the English Church can fairly be said to have been *under the usurped dominion of Rome* was from the surrender of King John, A.D. 1213, to the beginning of the Reformation, A.D. 1531, i.e., a period of little more than 300 years, or one-sixth of her existence." [60]

"The Church of England . . . . inherits, together with her apostolic ministry, the historical belief of the Church of Christ. In teaching the doctrines of the Holy

[59] Browne: *The Continuity of the Holy Catholic Church in England*, 1896, 1906, pp. 22-24; *The Continuity of Possession at the Reformation*, 1895 and 1897, pp. 4 to 20; and, *What is the Catholic Church in England?* 1897 and 1905, p. 183.

[60] Rev. A. E. Oldroyd's *Continuity of the English Church*, 3d edition, 1895, p. 19.

> Trinity and the Incarnation, she declares truth which is indeed her own, but which she has by virtue of her descent from the Apostles and her present essential union with the rest of the Church, and with our Lord. . . . Taking their stand on the belief and practice of the Universal Church, her children are upheld by the Catholic faith." [61]

I will now introduce an extract from an official statement made by one of the English Church societies, the Church Defence and Instruction Committee, under the presidency of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York:

1.—The Church is the society which was founded by Jesus Christ Himself.

2.—In England, the Church was not "established," or set up by the Parliament. She existed long before it.

Earliest recorded Bishops in Britain,	A.D. 314
First Archbishop of Canterbury . .	597
First King of England	827
First complete Parliament	1295

3.—No new Church was set up or established at the Reformation. The Church of England is the same society after as before, only reformed; and holds the same Creeds as before, administers the Sacraments as before, and has the same three orders of the ministry: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. These orders have been handed down from the Apostles' time, in an unbroken succession, by the laying on of hands in ordination.

4.—The Church of England never was a part of the Church of Rome, but was in communion with her up to the time of the Reformation. And while in communion with the Roman Church, the English Church continued to assert her own independence as a National Church, and struggled against every attempt on the part of the Church of Rome to take her independence away.

5.—The position of the Church of Rome, as regards doctrine, was not the same before the English Reformation as it is now.

6.—The Cathedrals, Parish Churches, and other property of the Church, never belonged to the Roman Church.

---

[61] Darwell Stone: *Outlines of Christian Dogma,* 1903, pp. 146 and 147.

They were built and founded by, and always belonged to, the Church of England.

7.—No act of Parliament took property from one religious body and handed it over to another.

8.—The property of the Church was not given to her by the state. It has been given voluntarily by Churchmen themselves, at different times during her long history.

English clergy have been particularly diligent in gathering materials for local and parochial history, and thus working out the details and illustrating the larger history of the nation. We cannot begin to go into this large matter of parochial or even diocesan histories, but we may take one as typical: The parish of Bretreton, county of Kent, was set apart in the year 903, and there is record of the clergy of the parish from 1323 down to the present day. The priest who held the living during the turning point of the Reformation held it also after the Reformation was an accomplished fact.[62]

It might be added that this Church, like all others in England, has never once been transferred by deed or legislation from its original owners, and therefore the present body is identical with the Church of 903 and 1323.

Canon Thynn's *History of Kilkhampton Church* mentions the fact that John Granville, who rebuilt the church in 1567, was rector of the parish from 1524 to 1580, a notable witness to the Church's continuity through all that troublous time. Croydon parish church bears on its walls a list of vicars going back to Elpie in A. D. 960.

The Rev. Bernard Gilpin was rector in the diocese of Durham during the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, and William Dawes of All Hallows', Barking, from 1542 to 1565; that is from the time when the revision of the service books began under Henry VIII. till the publication of Elizabeth's famous advertisements. "When Elizabeth came to the throne she was bent on preserving the distinctive marks of Church doctrine and practice against the destructive principles of the Calvinistic party just returned

[62] W. J. Rowe in *The Canadian Church*, March 29, 1906; *Church Eclectic*, June 1906.

red-hot from Geneva. And she found her support in the faithful Churchmen like Dawes, who were loyal to the throne and the independence of the Church against Papal assumption, and at the same time attached to the Liturgy and its ancient beginnings. And thus Dawes, like Gilpin in the North, could be at peace as a faithful English Churchman." [63]

We will note other histories which have a wide circulation, all written from the standpoint of the Catholic continuity of the Church of England:

1.—*The History of the Book of Common Prayer,* by the Rev. Leighton Pullan, Fellow of St. John Baptist's College, Oxford, 1900. (In "The Oxford Library of Practical Theology").

2.—*A Popular History of the Church of England from the Earliest Times to the Present Day,* by William Boyd Carpenter, Bishop of Ripon, Hon. D.C.L., Oxon, 1900.

3.—*Illustrated Notes on English Church History,* by the Rev. C. Arthur Lane; several editions.

4.—*Descriptive Lantern Lectures on English Church History,* by the Rev. C. A. Lane, 1892 and other editions. Dedicated, by permission, to William Stubbs.

5.—*Penny History of the Church of England,* by A. Jessopp, D.D., Chaplain to the King, 1908.

6.—*An English Church History for Children,* by Mary E. Shipley, with an introduction by Prof. W. E. Collins, Bishop of Gibraltar. 1908 and 1909, two vols: 597-1066, and from the Norman Conquest to A. D. 1500.

7.—*The Position of the Eucharist in Sunday Worship,* by W. H. Abraham, D.D. (contains a great many interesting facts of the English Reformation unfamiliar to the average reader of Reformation history). 1906.

8.—*Portraits of the Archbishops of Canterbury,* by G. M. Bevan, issued with the approval of the present Archbishop, 1908.

9.—*English Church History,* by the Rev. Alfred Plummer, Master of University College, Durham, 1905.

---

[63] *The Church Times,* London, June 8, 1906; Oct. 9, 1908.

10.—*The Reformation,* by the Rev. Anthony Deane, 1907.

11.—Vol. V. in the Stephens and Hunt "History of the English Church," *Elizabeth and James I.,* by the Rev. W. H. Frere.

12.—*Handbooks of English Church History,* edited by J. H. Burn, and now appearing serially. Esp. Dr. Gee's vol.

13.—*The Church of England,* by the Rev. R. E. Roberts, 1909.

14.—*A History of the Church of England,* by the Rev. M. W. Patterson, 1909.

15.—*Everyman's History of the English Church,* by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, 1909.

16.—"Oxford Church Text Books," 1905 to 1909, volumes by Wakeman and Pullan, Coleman, Stone, Field, and Ragg.

17.—"The Oxford Library of Practical Theology," volumes by Abraham, Gibson, Newbolt, and Whitham.

18.—*How the Church Came to England,* Hollis, 1905.

19.—*The Church in England,* Abbott-Smith, 1909.

20.—*A Goodly Heritage,* Forde, 1909.

"The ideal with which the Anglican Church set out [at the Reformation]—that of shaking off the secular domination of the Pope of Rome, while retaining unimpaired the credentials of the Church, the continuity of her orders, the Catholic Creeds, and the central body of essential Christian doctrine—was indeed attained, though through seasons of great risk and peril, and through exceedingly miry ways." "The stake was . . . . whether, in fact, the Church of England should formally repudiate, like the French and German reformers, Catholic doctrine and external continuity with the past, or whether she should maintain these essentials at all cost. Today the maintenance of the Catholicity of our Church is no longer in question among Churchmen."

"Though much was taken, much was left; the Church in England came through the storm with rent cordage and tattered sails, but still unmistakably an integral unit of the Church Universal, flying the old flag, set on the old course, manned by the old officers and crew, and obeying the same Captain." "The Reformers were careful to secure a valid and orderly succession of the ministry."

"The prospects of the nation, whether in Church or State, have seldom been more gloomy than they were at the acces-

sion of Elizabeth. Things were in confusion on every side, and change and reform were imperative. The position of the Church was especially dangerous. The persecutions had made the name of Rome odious to the people, and in the inevitable reaction there was serious risk that the Church would repudiate her Catholicity as well as the Papal supremacy." "In the passionate attachment of such men as George Herbert and Nicholas Ferrar to the Anglican Liturgy we recognize what must have been, through their influence and example, a potent factor in retaining that Liturgy unchanged in its essential features, when in 1662 was waged the final battle as to whether the Church should or should not abdicate her Catholic position." "Ferrar was in all essentials a sound Catholic Churchman of the Anglican type." But "he did not disdain to use the name of 'Protestant,' which had not then been dragged in the mud as it has since, and still connoted a living protest upon a matter of vital import. But before and above all he was a Catholic Churchman of the best and simplest type, a shining example to Anglicans for all time." [64]

Looking back at the long division of opinion and the weight attaching to both sides, there is one recent historian who can say that in his judgment one and only one view of the continuity of the English Church accords with history.

"Under the leadership of the great Roman See . . . . the younger nations of the West formed a real Christian commonwealth."

"One with the past not only in her unbroken descent, but in the devotion that was inspired by her altars and breathed in her prayers." "In later days she was to find out the value of having kept—what might have been so easily lost . . . . The carefully guarded validity of her orders, which so many other countries sacrificed, gave her a unique position and a many-sided future. The breach which she had to face was, as her formularies proved and her later history was to show, a breach with the papal Catholicism of Trent, but not a breach with the Catholicism of earlier medieval days, still less with the Church of the Fathers." [65]

As we are now about to take leave of a certain class of

[64] H. P. K. Skipton: *The Life and Times of Nicholas Ferrar* [1593-1637], 1907; pp. 1, 4, 8, 15, 151, and 152.

[65] *The Reformation,* 1503-1648 (1907). By the Rev. James Pounder Whitney, B.D., chaplain of St. Edward's, Cambridge, Hulsean Lecturer, etc., etc., and formerly principal of the University of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Canada. in "The Church Universal" series, edited by W. H. Hutton; pp. v, 1 and 2, 374, and 375.

historians, it will be well to add what Mr. Lecky says about them; and Mr. Lecky was no friend. At the time of Mr. Lecky's death several years ago I had the pleasure of quoting for the readers of the *Living Church* his generous words about the English Church, and will now enlarge the passage to take in his approving estimate of her historical writers. We read:

> "It might, perhaps, *a priori* have been imagined that a Church with so much diversity of opinion and of spirit was an enfeebled and disintegrated Church, but no candid man will attribute such a character to the Church of England. All the signs of corporate vitality are abundantly displayed, and it is impossible to deny that it is playing an active, powerful, and most useful part in English life. Looking at it first of all from the intellectual side, it is plain how large a proportion of the best intellect of the country is contented, not only to live within it, but to take an active part in its ministrations. Compare the amount of higher literature which proceeds from clergymen of the Established Church with the amount which proceeds from the vastly greater body of Catholic priests scattered over the world; compare the place which the English clergy, or laymen, deeply imbued with the teaching of the Church, hold in English literature with the place which Catholic priests or sincere Catholic laymen hold in the literature of France, and the contrast will appear sufficiently evident.
>
> "There is hardly a branch of serious English literature in which Anglican clergy are not conspicuous. There is nothing in a false and superstitious creed incompatible with some forms of literature. It may easily ally itself with the genius of a poet or with great beauty of style either hortatory or narrative. But in the Church of England literary achievement is certainly not restricted to these forms. In the fields of physical science, in the fields of moral philosophy, metaphysics, social and even political philosophy, and perhaps still more in the fields of history, its clergy have won places in the foremost rank. It is notorious that a large proportion of the most serious criticism, of the best periodical writing in England, is the work of Anglican clergymen. No one in enumerating the leading historians of the present century would omit such names as Milman, Thirlwall and Merivale, in the generation which has just passed away, or Creighton and Stubbs among contemporaries, and these are only eminent examples of a kind of literature to which the Church has very largely con-

tributed. Their histories are not specially conspicuous for beauty of style, and not only conspicuous for their profound learning; they are marked to an eminent degree by judgment, criticism, impartiality, a desire for truth, a skill in separating the proved from the false or the merely probable.

"It is at least one great test of a living Church that the best intellect of the country can enter into its ministry, that it contains men who in nearly all branches of literature are looked upon by lay scholars with respect and admiration. I believe it is true that there is no other Church which has shown itself so capable of attracting and retaining the services of men of general learning, criticism and ability." [66]

Section iv. The English Statesmen.

The year 1909 was the centennial of the birth of Mr. Gladstone, and the day is December 29. Mr. Gladstone has been described as "the world's greatest citizen" and as "a great Christian." Few men of all who ever lived have attained an eminence like his in politics, with a great position also in literature, science, and religion. "Four times at the head of the government, no phantom, but dictator," says Mr. Morley. Position and personality alike render it necessary that his views of the subject in hand should be heard.

Mr. Morley, Gladstone's great biographer, disclaims any purpose of presenting "the detailed history of Mr. Gladstone as theologian and Churchman . . . . and nobody is more sensible than the writer of the gap." Those who take Mr. Morley's disclaimer, made more than once, will find a surprise in the real sympathy and fairness with which the matters in the Church are treated. Ambassador Bryce is responsible for a short sketch of Mr. Gladstone.[67] The last chapter deals with religious character, and is lamentably deficient. It completely fails to bring out the great and striking facts of a great religious career, and utterly misses the spirit of the statesman's life. Withholding sympathy and information on the religious side of Gladstone's activity is to miss its spring and inspiration. In his Lincoln birthday address on Feb. 12, 1909, at Springfield, Ill., Mr. Bryce referred to three other famous men who were born in

[66] Lecky: *The Map of Life*, pp. 213-217.
[67] 1898, 104 pages. See p. 97.

the same year with Lincoln. "Gladstone," he said, was "the most powerful, versatile, and high minded statesman of the last two generations in Britain." It will hardly be believed that such an admiring eulogist would be guilty of deliberately withholding from Mr. Gladstone the one profession which to him was as honourable as it was life long: "He did not make what is commonly called a profession of religion." What these words mean to Mr. Bryce would be hard to discern; to the average American they could mean but one thing, and that is the direct reverse of Mr. Gladstone's actual attitude in the Church, which was one of outspoken loyalty, intense interest, earnest occupation, and constant communion.

A third political biography is by Justin McCarthy, and this too is unsatisfactory and meagre on the religious side. Mr. Lathbury's is not very much better. On the whole, Morley's is the best. As Professor Elson said in Boston on August 26, 1908, Gladstone was "the union of conscience and statecraft." And the light of his conscience was religion; and his religion was the Church of England. Mr. Morley graphically tells the story how impossible it was for the outbursts of righteous passion, the time spent in religious study and work, the love of the Church, to be understood by the merely average politician or journalist.

Of Lord Acton's opinion of Gladstone, his editors say:

> "It was not his successes so much as his failures that attracted Acton, and above all, his refusal to admit that nations, in their dealings with one another, are subject to no law but that of greed . . . . It was because he was not like Lord Palmerston, because Bismarck disliked him, because he gave back the Transvaal to the Boers, and tried to restore Ireland to its people, because his love of liberty never weaned him from loyalty to the Crown, and his politics were part of his religion, that Acton used of Gladstone language rarely used, and still more rarely applicable to any statesman."[68] Lord Acton calls him "our greatest statesman."

In 1840 Mr. Gladstone published his book, *Church Principles Considered in Their Results.* The title page bears

[68] Acton: *History of Freedom,* XXIII., and *Letters,* p. 310.

this from St. Augustine: "Follow the way of Catholic discipline; to us it has come from Christ through the Apostles, and from us it will remain to our children and our children's children." This is a book of 560 pages addressed to the thought and need of the day; but we have every reason to affirm that Mr. Gladstone never changed these principles throughout his long and active life. He says:

> "If I found that I had been wrong in believing the English Church to answer to the description given in Scripture of the Church, if I could not recognize in her the character belonging to the part of that permanent body which is to be preserved to the end in all necessary truth, I should be bound in conscience . . . . to look elsewhere." "We follow the institution, which, existing in this country for sixteen hundred years or more . . . . has given us the primitive Creeds of the Church . . . which has testified to the truth and wrought righteousness among the people . . . . It is not our business to make a Church . . . . it is alike the business of him, of you, and of me, to find and recognize the features of that religion, and that Church, which God appointed, and which is among us the local representative of that universal body."
>
> "The English Church, as she had existed for centuries before she came into ecclesiastical connection with Rome, was not bound to receive the dogmas or the practices of the Roman Bishop as determining the truth of the Gospel." . . . . The Church of England "is this day historically the same institution through which the Gospel was originally preached to the English." [69]

The next year, 1841, Mr. Gladstone revised *The State in its Relations with the Church,* which had been published originally in 1838. Here he says:

> "In England . . . . the course of events was widely different from that which we have just reviewed (in Germany). Her Reformation, through the Providence of God, succeeded in maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church in her apostolical ministry. We have therefore still among us the ordained hereditary witnesses of the truth conveying it to us through an unbroken series, from our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles . . . . Our Church never taught that men were free to frame any religion from Scripture which they pleased, or to form a diversity of com-

[69] Gladstone: *Church Principles,* etc., pp. 290, 291, 292, 312, 313.

munions . . . . The acts of her Reformation established the claim of the nation to be free from external control . . . . but not from Catholic consent."

"The opinions of some of the individuals instrumental in our Reformation were perhaps nearly the same as those professed by the Continental Protestants; but in England they took less of permanent effect because the organization of the Church, through God's peculiar mercy, was still preserved to us." To prove this, he quotes Dr. Horne's paper of March, 1559, at the beginning of the resettlement under Elizabeth: "'We have for our mother the true and Catholic Church of Christ, which is grounded upon the doctrine of the Apostles and Prophets, and is of Christ the head in all things governed; we do reverence her judgment, we obey her authority as becometh children; and we do devoutly profess and in all points follow the faith which is contained in the Three Creeds; that is to say, of the Apostles, of the Council of Nice, and of Athanasius.'" [70]

Where is the appeal to the Thirty-nine Articles which some recent writers have erected into the new creed of the English Church?

"I can find no trace of that opinion which is now so common in the mouths of unthinking persons, that the Roman Catholic Church was abolished at the time of the Reformation, and that a Protestant Church was put in its place; nor does there appear to have been so much as a doubt in the minds of any one of them (the Reformers) whether this Church, legally established in England after the Reformation, was the same institution with the Church legally established in England before the Reformation." [71]

In 1878-'79 Mr. Gladstone published his *Gleanings From Past Years,* in which we read:

The member of the English Church "conceives himself bound to the communion of the Catholic Church in England, and therein differing from those who conceive their adhesion to be a matter of the class of things indifferent."

"Those who argue for the Catholicity of the Church of England in all points which relate to her constitution and rites, to her view of the episcopate and the sacraments, found themselves upon the tone of her authorized formularies to make good their case."

"The statutory settlement, at the Reformation, of the

[70] Gladstone: *The State,* etc., 3d ed. 1839, 4th ed., Vol. II., pp. 95, 100, etc.

[71] Gladstone: *The State,* etc., quoted by Oldroyd and others.

ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Crown was in part founded upon the anterior proceedings of the Church."

"I have read with some surprise . . . . the assertion that . . . . the power of the Pope was transferred in its entireness to the Crown . . . . That the Pope was the source of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the English Church before the Reformation is an assertion of the gravest import. . . . . It is one which I firmly believe to be false in history, false in law."

The Church of England "declares herself, and is supposed by the law of the country to be, the ancient and Catholic Church of the country." [72]

Mr. G. W. E. Russell wrote a short paper in which full justice is done to the one great passion that kept all Mr. Gladstone's career clean and generous. The love of God and Holy Church were the secrets of it all. An intellect massive and active never found need to question the Catholic faith. Sunday was a day of quiet worship. The Prime Minister was never too busy to study religion along with literature. A call to rule the nation was a call to prayer and Eucharist. A mission in the parish at home meant his rising at four to make his Communion with the miners. Even the daily Eucharist was not too monotonous for his fresh and vigorous soul. He was not afraid to write that the Divinity of our Lord was the first conviction of his life,[73] and our Lord's Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist was the magnet that drew his devotion. After his death, Mr. Russell obtained at Mrs. Gladstone's hands the priceless privilege of looking into his note book of devotion. All the life long there was never a loss or a change in his faith or in his loyal service. He was the first friend to represent at court where Bishops are appointed the Catholicism of the Church of England, to which he was heartily attached. He came into power at a time when state appointments in the Church were being made on lines that were no less than wicked. Any school text book that recognizes Mr. Glad-

[72] Gladstone: *Gleanings,* etc., Vol. V., pp. 38, 49, 189, 194, 195; Vol. VI., p. 159.

[73] Kilbourn: *Faiths of Famous Men in Their Own Words,* 1900, pp. 190 and 191, gives the original authority and circumstance of Mr. Gladstone's words: "All that I think, all that I hope, all that I write, all that I live for, is based upon the divinity of Jesus Christ, the central joy of my poor, wayward life."

stone's political and intellectual greatness gives teachers and parents at least some opportunity to speak of these sacred associations. Mr. Gladstone was a more priceless possession, a more wonderful achievement of the Church of England, than any of the Cathedrals which she has built.

In his remarkable volume, *The Household of Faith,* Mr. Russell first presents us with a paper on his great master, entitled "Mr. Gladstone's Religious Development." Mr. Russell quotes some portions of the opinions given above, expressed 1838, 1840, and at other times, and adds these latest words of Mr. Gladstone's, 1895:

> "The Church of England, I am persuaded, will do nothing in regard to faith or discipline to compromise or impair her character as the Catholic and Apostolic Church of this country." In 1895 again, in a letter to Father Tagliahie; "It will surprise you to learn my belief that I was born, and have always lived, in the Catholic Church of this country, founded long before St. Augustine extended it; and that by leaving it I should commit an act of rashness and a great sin."

It is certainly not too much to say that this paper is essential to the least approach to a comprehension of Mr. Gladstone's motives and actions. If the power of example is anything and the weight of a great mind and a great career is to be allowed for, we should set a priceless value upon this revelation of the man for men, and upon the story of Mrs. Gladstone (told in another paper) for men and women.

There is in this volume another paper which is pertinent.

Mr. Russell answers an article by Augustine Birrell entitled, "What, then, did happen at the Reformation?" This answer is in the paper "Reformation and Reunion" in the volume quoted above. "I would venture," he says, "to tell Mr. Birrell that the following were the most important of the many and far-reaching events which happened at the period vaguely known as the Reformation:

"1. The translation of the Bible.

"2. The revision of Liturgy and Offices.

"3. The dissolution of the Monasteries.

"4. The permission of marriage to the Clergy.
"5. The repudiation of the Pope's authority."

Another Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, now head of the Liberal party's administration of the British government, said on March 21, 1895, in a speech in the House of Commons:

> "I am not one of those who think . . . . that the legislation of Henry VIII. transferred the privileges and endowments . . . . from the Church of Rome to the Church of England. I believe that view rests upon imperfect historical information. I am quite prepared to admit, what I believe the best authorities of history now assert, that there has been amidst all these changes and developments a substantial identity and continuity of existence in our National Church from earliest history down to the present time." [74]

It is well known that Lord Salisbury, Mr. Gladstone's political opponent and like him a great Victorian Prime Minister, was of the same conviction in the matter of the Catholic character and continuity of the English Church; and that Lord Halifax has devoted his life of great industry and a mind of rare power to the service of the English Church, in whose continuity and Catholicity he believes almost as the first article of his faith. As head of the English Church Union, his keen thinking and brave, enterprising action have always been at the service of the Church for the sake of the people of England.

Now, what underlies all this mass of authorities, modern and ancient? Simply the official words of the Book of Common Prayer:

> "Alterations . . . . we have rejected . . . . as secretly striking at some . . . laudable practice . . . of the whole Catholic Church." (The Preface, added 1662.)
>
> "Common Prayer and . . . . Sacraments of the Church according to the use of the Church of England." The Prayer Book is regarded as Catholic custom localized in England. (The Title Page.)
>
> "In these our doings we condemn no other nations." (Preface on Ceremonies.)
>
> "It is evident . . . . that from the Apostles' time

[74] *Handy Volume*, p. 154. Asquith again, forward, p. 277.

> there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church. . . . . No man might presume to execute any of them except he . . . . with Imposition of Hands were . . . . admitted thereto. And, therefore, *to the intent that these Orders may be continued* . . . . no man shall be . . . . taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England . . . . except he be . . . . admitted . . . . according to the Form . . . . following, or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration, or Ordination." (Ordinal, printed in every Prayer Book.)

The Form provides laying on of Bishop's hands for all three Orders. A more distinct mode of continuing the old Church and ministry in word and act, would be impossible to imagine. In the American book, the words "Church of England" were changed to "this Church." American continuity was secured in the consecration of Seabury,[75] despite difficulties, and in all subsequent Episcopal consecrations, 244 in number up to January 1, 1910.

---

[75] Morehouse: *Some American Churchmen*, 1892, and Seabury: *Memoir of Bishop Seabury*, 1908.

CHAPTER XVI.

COMPARATIVE SCOTTISH TREATMENT.

While Scotland is not the field of our present study, we gain greatly in the clearness of our final view of things by a comparison, by noticing the mode of treatment adopted by the historians of what we might call the adjacent Reformation. The first thing that strikes us is the singular unanimity of view in secular and ecclesiastical, old and new, scholars. One very old history devotes only 16 pages out of its 500 to the pre-Reformation Christianity of Scotland. Apparently "the Scottish Church" is not concerned with it. The historian[1] evidently felt that the former era in Scotland was preparatory and in a way alien and antagonistic to the present Protestant era, just as in beginning Church history we are told of Greek literature, Hebrew religion, and Roman law, as forces prior to, contributing to, yet in a way alien to Christianity.

Another constructs his work with a more generous proportion assigned to the former period, as many as 212 out of 1,193 pages. And he seems on the point of developing a theory of continuity from the first period to the second, when suddenly we find that he has thrown up the sponge in this manner: He surrenders the idea of continuity, and says definitely "the patrimony of the old Church" is appropriated by the new. ("Its appropiation by the new"). The old ministry was not recognized. "Many of the clergy thus reduced to want became proselytes for a morsel of bread,

---

[1] Hetherington: *History of the Scottish Church.*

and received employment in the Protestant Church." "The old Church had been thrown down—a new one must be reared out of its ruins."[2]

A third history is in eight large volumes, nearly 5,500 pages. There can be no doubt that it speaks for the generality of Presbyterian opinion, not only because of its agreement with the statements of the preceding histories, but also because it bears the somewhat authoritative mark of publication by "the Woodrow Society, instituted for the publication of the works of the Fathers and early writers of the Reformed Church of Scotland." This history does not begin before James V., 1514, though there is a "Preamble" of 55 pages.[3]

And a fourth history of the older line takes the same course. It tells the story of a break from the Church of the past.[4] A fifth gives 641 pages to the first period, 931 to the second.[5] The Reformation leader in Scotland, John Knox, did not regard his work as a reform in the Church, as will be seen by his radical words introducing his history:

"The first book of the History of the Reformation of Religion within the realm of Scotland, containing the manner and by what persons the Light of Christ's Evangel hath been manifested unto this realm, after that horrible and universal defection from the truth, which has come by the means of that Roman Anti-Christ." [6]

It must be said that no nation had so great cause to go heart and soul into anything that would relieve the bad conditions existing under the Roman Church. These conditions were intolerable to honest society. They may have been due as much to the distance as to the domination of Rome. When we pass from the old line denominational histories to the new, we find the break, the loss of continuity in Scotland, asserted in the new, just as it was in the old—

[2] Cunningham: *The Church History of Scotland,* pp. 364, 383, 388, 390, and 355.
[3] Calderwood: *History of the Kirk of Scotland,* 1842 to 1849.
[4] John Row: *The History of the Kirk of Scotland,* ed. of 1842 (Woodrow Society).
[5] George Grub: *Ecclesiastical History of Scotland.*
[6] Knox: *History of the Reformation in Scotland,* repub., ed. by C. J. Guthrie, Q. C., London, 1898.

alike in the secular and denominational writers. No position could be more distinct that this: "In the spring of 1559, the Queen Regent entered upon her new line of policy. A Provincial Council of the clergy was summoned to meet on the first of March for the express purpose of dealing with the religious difficulty. It was the last Provincial Council of the ancient Church that was to meet in Scotland; and, if the expression of its good intention could have availed, the Church might yet have been saved . . . . . It was revolution and not reform on which the new teachers were now bent. . . . . At length the Regent took the step which was to be the beginning of the end of the Catholic Church in Scotland. The estates met on the 3d of August (1560). In three successive acts, all passed in one day, it was decreed that the National Church should cease to exist."[7]

Under date of 1561 he says: "By the enactments of the preceding year the ancient Church had been swept away; but the work of rearing a new edifice in its place still remained to be accomplished. With this object the Protestant ministers had been entrusted with the task of drafting a constitution for a new Church which should take the place of the old." "The fundamental question . . . . was the question of the 'sustentation' of the new Church. The answer given was the most natural in the world; the Reformed Church had an indisputable right to the entire inheritance of the Church it had displaced." The author speaks of the "corruptions of the old Church." John Knox objected to the English Liturgy because it appeared to him "rather to be devised for upholding of massing priests." Brown speaks of the new Church.[8] The same view of the Scottish Reformation being disconnected and in disunion with the early Scottish Church is taken by the Rev. D. Hay

[7] "Cambridge Historical Series," edited by G. W. Prothero, Litt.D., formerly Professor of History in the University of Edinburgh. *A History of Scotland,* by P. Hume Brown, M.A., Litt.D., Fraser Professor of Ancient Scottish History, etc., in the University of Edinburgh, Vol. II., issued 1902.

[8] The same: Pp. 54, 55, 70, 71, 74, 75, 112, 109, 293.

Fleming, LL.D., who speaks of "the upbuilding of the new-born Church."[9]

Professor Story's book apparently opens on the theory of continuity in Scotland, judging from its preface and method, but actually does not. In Volume II., Book III., we read, "Having already shown in detail the causes that led to the overthrow, in 1560, of the Church established in Scotland by St. Margaret and St. David in the end of the eleventh and beginning of the twelfth century, we are free at once to enter on an account of the constitution and career of the Church that succeeded it; for there was no interval between the two, the suppression of the one and the substitution of the other being the work of the same Parliament, and even of the same day." [10]

Andrew Lang says:

"A new anti-Catholic kirk was thus set up on July 20, before the Convention met and swept away Catholicism."[11]

Dr. Mitchell shows us, in 1559, priests, but not recognized as such, coming as laymen to "join the Reformed congregation of St. Andrew's"; and other priests are admitted as "readers." It is frankly a new Church.[12] The same is true in Germany, and for this we will introduce as typical the witness of just one historian. It shows that the Reformation parallel is between Scotland and Germany and not between Scotland and England.

Ranke finds that the Reformation in Germany established a new Church there. "It is worth while," he says, "at the point at which we have arrived, where we have to examine into the foundation of the Evangelical Church, to endeavour to acquire a precise and comprehensive notion of

---

[9] Fleming: Writing in the series, "Handbooks for Senior Classes," published by the Scottish Reformation Society, Edinburgh 1903.

[10] Story: *The Church of Scotland, Past and Present,* edited by Robert H. Story, D.D., Prof. of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Glasgow, p. 430.

[11] Lang: *John Knox and the Reformation,* p. 170. See the same view in Mackintosh: *The Story of Scotland,* 1890, pp. 136 and 139, and Mathieson: *Politics and Religion in Scotland,* 1902, Vol. I., p. 187.

[12] Mitchell: *The Scottish Reformation.* Baird Lectures of 1899. By the late Rev. Alexander F. Mitchell, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in St. Andrew's University. Page 13.

the circumstances under which it took place." He speaks of it as "the secession." [13]

Dean H. M. Luckock speaks of the Scottish Reformation as resulting in "the overthrow of the Historic Church."[14] Sir Walter Scott in his novel, *The Monastery,* gives the idea that the Holy Scriptures were the peculiar property of the Reformers. How differently modern history might have been written; how strong religion might have been to solve the problems and reduce the evils which came out of the saloon, the monopoly and other black spots in present day life; how might the irreligious family have been a rarity instead of the rule amongst us if the Church in Scotland could have been conservatively reformed;[15] if these first revolutionists had recognized the old Scottish Church as Catholic in origin and mission, Scottish in race jurisdiction, and Roman only by accident; susceptible of reform and by right the guardian, transmitter, and teacher of the much neglected Holy Scripture. In such a case English and Scottish people would have stood as one; in America, the Presbyterian and Episcopal systems would have been merged into one stream. What a vision of rivalry healed, of religious poverty and weakness and inefficiency made strong!

Yet the case is not beyond curing. If we cannot have the ounce of prevention then we may have the pound of cure.

The Scottish kirk historians frankly admit the break. Disunion results. Can the disunion best be healed by taking away the historic episcopate from the Episcopal people, or by giving it back to the Presbyterian people?

Whatever path may be indicated for the future, in estimating the past we can find practically all agree that in

---

[13] Ranke: *History of the Reformation in Germany,* Vol. II., page 489 of the second London edition, 1845.

[14] Luckock: *Scotland,* in "The National Church" series. Dr. C. A. Briggs, Professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, seems to disagree with the voice of Scottish authority shown above. See *Church Unity,* 1909, pp. 90 and foll.

[15] That this was actually intended in Scotland, is the theme of a *History of the Reformation and Church in Scotland,* by Thomas Stephen, 1831.

Scotland a new Church was intentionally founded on the ruins of the Scottish Catholic Church, which was then under Roman domination.[16]

[16] In support of this, see Gore, *Orders and Unity*, 1909, p. 39 note, pp. 179, 181.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE VERDICT OF THE LAW.

We will set at the opening of this section the words: "History, to be above evasion or dispute, must stand on documents, not on opinions." [16]

The first document in importance in establishing the continuity is the Great Charter—*Magna Charta.* I believe only one of the widely used school histories gives this essential document and enables teachers to point out its famous phrase, "The Church of England shall be free." That the Pope was against the Charter, and the Church and nation in its favor, is a fact which must not be lost sight of. There is no fair history until this is known. A splendid commentary on *Magna Charta* says, on the meaning of *Quod Anglicana Ecclesia libera sit:*

> "It is clear that the movement which culminated in the Charter of 21st Nov., 1214, originated in England, not at Rome; and apparently Nicholas, the papal legate at that date, opposed the endeavours of Stephen Langton to obtain it. The Archbishop indeed looked upon the legate as the chief obstacle to the reform by the king of the grievances of the National Church." In a note on alterations of details in the Charter's reissue in 1216, he says: "These alterations show traces of some influence at work hostile to the National Church . . . . Now the papal legate was an active supporter of the reissue of this Charter in 1216; whereas Rome, in the crisis of June, 1215, had been bitterly opposed to the

[16] The American teacher will perhaps allow me to say that I first saw these wise words for the historian in the New England Teachers' Association Report for 1900. I hope this will carry them a long way with all teachers. They may be found also in Acton: *Lectures on Modern History,* 1906, p. 17.

original grant of Magna Carta." On Henry III.'s acting upon the above, "the King and the Pope entered into a tacit partnership for their mutual benefit at the expense of the English National Church." As various authors appear to show divers figures for the times of confirmation of the Charter, we notice that this commentary says simply "time after time." [17]

Again, *Quod Anglicana Ecclesia libera sit* is thus commented on by Aubrey L. Moore: "However vague this clause might be, it clearly reënacted all that was most offensive to the Pope in the Constitutions of Clarendon" (primarily the free election to bishoprics, etc.).[18]

> "The Great Charter hath been confirmed more than thirty Times, yet no one will infer from thence that it was not a compleat Act in the first Instance. In Truth, the Confirmation of an Act did not add to its legal Efficacy, but, by bringing it more recently to Memory, under the Authority of the Legislature, was thought to make the Dread of Non-Observance the greater." [19]

Two American writers have given us works on constitutional history of such notable merit and of such value from a civic and loyal point of view that they have been placed in this section rather than with the histories.

I. One of them is Dr. Hannis Taylor. In taking a new American point of view, or rather perhaps in presenting it in a stronger way than had been done before, Dr. Taylor said:

> "The constitutional histories of England and of the United States constitute a continuous and natural evolution which can only be fully mastered when viewed as one unbroken story."
>
> "The federal republic of the United States was the fruit of a process of voluntary and conscious reproduction." [20]

---

[17] McKechnie: *Magna Carta, a Commentary on the Great Charter of King John, with an Historical Introduction,* by William Sharp McKechnie, D.Phil., etc., Lecturer on Constitutional Law and History in the University of Glasgow, author, etc., Glasgow, 1905; pp. 227 and 167.

[18] Moore: *Lectures and Papers on the History of the Reformation in England and on the Continent,* by A. L. M., while acting as deputy to the Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, 1880-1890. Page 35, and note.

[19] *The Statutes at Large from Magna Carta to the End of the Last Parliament,* 1761, in eight volumes, by Owen Ruffhead, Esq., London, MDCCLXIX, Preface, p. xix.

[20] Taylor: *The Origin and Growth of the English Constitution,* An Historical Treatise by Hannis Taylor, LL.D., Late Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to Spain, 1898. Part II., preface p. v., and p. 79.

This is exactly the position taken by Professor Freeman on his visit to America:

> "Nothing annoyed him more than to hear Americans and English refer to each other as foreigners. At one of the college dinners to which he was invited in America, a gentleman proposed his health in kind and flattering terms, but spoke of him as a man of a foreign nationality. 'In my answer,' he says, 'while I thanked the proposer of the toast for everything else that he had said, I begged him to withdraw one word. I was not of foreign nationality, but of the same nationality as himself.' My answer was warmly cheered." "The English kernel is so strong as to draw to itself every foreign element." [21]

It is this closeness of interest and of life which makes the value of Dr. Hannis Taylor's great work as a work in law and constitutional history.

Dr. Taylor takes the side more congenial to English scholars, but less popular amongst the American readers for whom he has written. To some of them indeed, his positions would be a surprise. He speaks of the English Church before the Reformation "whose character had always been distinctly national"; of the "drawing . . . . from its position of independence and isolation into closer relations with the rest of Western Christendom." [22]

Under Theodore there is "a truly national Church . . . . the nursery of a national spirit which finally ripened into a complete sense of a national consciousness. The unity of the Church led the way to the unity of the State." Here you find nationalism at the first not inconsistent with communion with Rome, a condition which later, owing to the advanced exactions of Rome, became impossible.[23]

At the Reformation and under Elizabeth, vacancies in bishopries were filled "in such a way as to comply with the theory of apostolic succession." [24]

The index recognizes the Church of England from the beginning, Roman Catholics only after the Reformation.

---

[21] Stephens: *Freeman*, Vol. II., p. 180.
[22] Taylor: *The Origin*, etc., Part II., p. 58; Part I., p. 259. The language is the same.
[23] The same: Part I., p. 161.
[24] The same: Part II., p. 157.

There existed a "vital link binding the new to the old episcopate," "a spiritual lineage beyond all question." [25]

II. The second is the new president of Harvard University. The value of his great book, a joy and an authority already on both sides of the Atlantic, lies, in reference to our present subject, more in what he leaves unsaid than in any passage which may be cited. Twice he praises the Church of England for her practical work; and more than once, and in different ways, he says what must surely be a surprise to most American newspapers and school teachers, that "the Church is not supported by taxation"; but he does not treat the Catholicity or continuity of the English Church, and we cannot but think that he has taken a step in the right direction. Wisely recognizing here that histories disagree, and that something is involved wherein the religious faith of people plays a part, he sets the good precedent for all teachers, and lets it alone.[26]

We will now turn to the English books of law.

> "Church of England . . . The Church of England, *Ecclesia Anglicana,* claims to be the branch of the Catholic Church in England.
>
> "The Church of England requires her members to believe in 'the Holy Catholic Church' (Apostles' Creed) and 'one Catholic and Apostolic Church' (Nicene Creed). For the meaning of the word Catholic, as understood in English ecclesiastical law, see the letter of George Bull, Bishop of St. David's, to Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, cited by Sir R. Phillimore, Official Principal of the Arches Court." [27]
>
> "In a manifesto issued in March, 1851, by the two Archbishops and twenty Bishops of the Church of England, in view of a bull promulgated by the then Pope Pius IX., in which he had divided England and Wales into Roman Catholic dioceses, a declaration was made to the effect that the Church of England at the Reformation had rejected certain corruptions and innovations of Rome, and established 'one uniform ritual,' but without in any degree severing her connection with the ancient Catholic Church."

---

[25] The same: Part II., p. 158.

[26] Abbott Lawrence Lowell: *The Government of England,* 1908; Vol. II., pp. 367 and 379, 377.

[27] *Encyclopedia of the Laws of England,* Vol. III. Edited by A. Wood Renton, M.A., LL.B., of Gray's Inn, and of the Oxford Circuit, Barrister at Law, London and Edinburgh, 1897.

"The word 'Protestant' occurs in the Coronation service, in the repealed portions of the Act of Union, and in certain modern Acts of Parliament, *e. g.,* 3 and 4 Vict. c. xxxiii.; 5 Vict. c. 6, in reference to the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America; but it has never been adopted by the Church of England in any formulary, and its statutory use must be taken to indicate the independent national existence of the Church of England and her independence of the See of Rome, and not as expressing an identity of position or doctrine between the Church of England and general foreign Protestantism as such. On the contrary, the Church of England recognizes the Holy Orders of the Greek and Roman Church, but not those of foreign Protestant bodies.

"It should be added that the word 'Catholic' is occasionally restricted in popular conversation to the Church of the Roman Catholic communion. Whatever other justification may be pleaded for this, so far as England is concerned, there is no legal authority for such use of the word."

"English Roman Catholics after [1570] were first known to the law as papists or as popish recusants . . . . subsequently as Roman Catholics, the Act 10, George IV. C. 7, being entitled An Act for the relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. . . . .

"It was not the object of the framers of the Reformation statutes either to establish a new faith or to create a new Church. . . . . On the *doctrinal* side, the Church of England at the Reformation repudiated certain mediæval accretions of doctrine, and remodelled and translated into the vernacular its forms of service and formularies, and determined certain points of controversy by her Thirty-nine Articles; but as before, so after the Reformation, the law of the Church of England and her history are to be deduced from the ancient canon law, from the particular constitutions made in this country to regulate the English Church, from the rubric and occasionally acts of Parliament; and the whole may be illustrated also by the writings of eminent persons."

"*Constitutionally,* the Reformation took the form of a restoration to the crown of its ancient jurisdiction over the estate ecclesiastical and spiritual, and an abolition of all foreign powers repugnant to the same." [28]

The coronation oath of the sovereign is of civil and not of

[28] The same: pp. 11, 12, and 13.

ecclesiastical origin; though administered by the Archbishop of Canterbury, it is exacted by Parliament alone. Hence its words "Protestant Reformed religion established by law" are the more striking as showing that the state could use terms which have never been uttered by the Church. This oath dates only from I. William IV., Ch. 6, 1824. The view-point of civil law in the motives for common cause against Rome by State and Church are thus given:

> "In process of time, the Bishop of Rome (by means incredible, if the facts did not evince it) usurped an absolute sovereignty in matters spiritual within this kingdom. Then the supremacy was, the Pope's power to do what he listed without control, either as reason dictated, or his interest guided, or his passions swayed; I say *usurped;* because it was strenuously opposed by the whole estate of the realm, the King, Lords, and Commons assembled in Parliament. Vigorous laws were enacted; but for a long time they were ineffectual." [29]

In the laws of A.D. 1400, in the second year of Henry IV., Chapter XV., we find the words:

> "The orthodoxy of the faith of the Church of England asserted," and the words occur *Ecclesia Anglicana*—5th line, 18th line, 32d line. The Statute of Provisors was confirmed 1389, the thirteenth year of Richard II., in an act containing the words, "Touching the estate of the Church of England," originally "*De seinte esglise d engleterre.*" The act also used the term "the Pope of Rome." The Provisors statute was 25th year of Edward III., Statute 6, and A. D. 1350, and says the Holy Church of England was founded by Edward I. (grandfather of the King that now is) and his progenitors, and the earls, etc., and their ancestors. The statute is against the control of the "Bishop of Rome" "Cardinals" and other "aliens." "Church of England" occurs three times at least, in old French, as before. [30]

Another:

> "The English Church would have been more correctly described as the Church of South Britain, for it included the Church of Wales, which was amalgamated with it in the twelfth century. In the Great Charter of Henry III. (A. D. 1224) the united Church is styled the Church of England (*Ecclesia Anglicana*) and it has borne the same

[29] Burn: *Ecclesiastical Law.* Vol. I., p. 397, and Dedication, pp. iv. and v.
[30] Ruffhead: *Statutes at Large.*

name ever since. In 25 Edward III., Statute 4, it is styled the "Holy Church of England," and in 24 Henry VIII., chapter XII., the "English."

Under *History:* "The history of the South British Church cannot be gone into here, but it may be useful to mention that it was founded by Greek missionaries in apostolic and sub-apostolic times, and has had a continuous existence ever since."

"The Reformation did not create a new Church, it only effected certain theological and moral changes in the existing Church. As Archdeacon Sharp says in a passage often quoted, 'The Church of England was the same Church she had been before, as much as a face that is washed is the same that it was before when it was dirty.' It is this religious continuity which creates most of the difficulties which arise in ascertaining what the law of the Church is." [31]

We notice that when King John, false to his kingship and to his kingdom, resigns the crown and kingdom to the Pope in the year 1213, he gives up to "the Church of Rome." He does not give up to the Catholic Church. It is this ancient precedent of nomenclature which the scholars of the Church of England retain in use today.

The association between acts of parliament and teachings of the Church is not a close one. At times Parliament would stand for only a minimum of religious truth. The acts of Parliament and the utterances of sovereigns, when cited as evidence, can only show, therefore, the current of opinion of the time; it cannot show the Church teaching. We can take extracts from laws and letters royal to show that legal opinion did not question the Catholicity and continuity of the Church. In 1532-3, the twenty-fourth year of Henry VIII., an act was passed which said "that Part of the Body politick, called the Spiritualty, now being usually called the *English* Church, which always hath been reputed and also found of that Sort . . . . the king's most noble Progenitors, and the Antecessors of the Nobles of this Realm, have sufficiently endowed the said Church," etc. These phrases constitute a direct contradiction of the statements such as those of Cheyney (which are the extreme limit) together with all of his school of speaking; they are

[31] Whitehead: *Church Law: A Concise Dictionary.* By Benj. Whitehead of the Middle Temple. 2d ed. 1899, p. 130.

a direct documentary refutation from original sources of the partisan generalizations of Macaulay. That Elizabeth agreed entirely with Henry VIII. in the assertion of the oneness and continuity of the Church of England, ancient and modern, will appear from "A Declaration of the Queen's Proceedings," made in her eleventh year, or 1569. She first states (as against the "malicious") that she does not take to herself "any superiority to define, decide, or determine any Article or Point of the Christian Faith and religion, or to change any ancient ceremony of the Church from the form before received and observed by the Catholic and Apostolic Church." She intends to see, "that the Church may be governed and taught . . . . according to the ecclesiastical ancient Policy of the Realm." [32]

Sir Roundell Palmer, Earl of Selborne, was a man of such conspicuous standing, at the head of his profession, that he would not be likely to lend the weight of his name and opinion to untenable and impossible causes. Writing for Americans and for teachers it is necessary to show the position which he held. He was born in 1812, was elected to Parliament in 1847, was made Solicitor General in 1861, Attorney General in 1863, sat in Parliament in 1861, 1865, and 1868, where he became one of the ablest debaters of the Liberal party. In 1872 he became Lord Chancellor of England, and was raised to the peerage as Baron Selborne of Selborne. In 1877 he was elected Lord Rector of St. Andrew's University. He died in 1895. His words on the English Church follow:

> "Coming, then, to the history of the Church of England as an organized institution, the first thing of which I would take notice is, that it is the most ancient and venerable institution of all in this country. It has existed, in unbroken succession, for about thirteen hundred years, ever since the first conversion of the heathen Saxons by Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury; from whom the present Archbishop of Canterbury (then Benson) is the ninety-fourth successor, in a line never interrupted. Our own Bishop of Winchester is (in like manner) the 79th Bishop, in an uninterrupted line of succession, from the time when Winchester first became the seat of a Bishopric, just eighty

[32] Ruffhead: *Statutes at Large*, Vol. II., p. 177.

years after the coming of Augustine." On page 16 he says; "I know that some people are to be found who pretend that a new Church of England was set up at that time ['at the time of the Reformation under King Henry the Eighth'] and the old Church cast out, and that all the churches, parsonages, glebes, remaining Church-titles, and other endowments of which I have been speaking were then taken from the Roman Catholic and given by the state to a new Protestant Church. For that pretence there is no foundation, in law or in fact."

"A Church does not lose its identity, or sameness, as an original institution, by changes in form or ceremony, or in laws of discipline, or by reforming itself from what it regards as abuses or corruptions. Dr. Hook, the late Dean of Chichester, put this in a very clear way when he said 'that a man whose face has got dirty, and who washes the dirt off, is the same man after he has washed his face that he was before.' In the English Reformation, the organization of the Church, as the Church of England, was not displaced or broken at any single point; nothing of importance was done, as to its doctrine, worship, government, or discipline, except by the action or with the concurrence of the Church itself . . . . And I think it right to add, that nothing was then done which made the Church of England really different, in any point of substance affecting religious faith or practice, from what it had originally been in the days of Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury, before the beginning of divisions in Christendom." He quotes Freeman as already cited, with this in addition; "As a matter of law and history, as a matter of plain fact, there was no taking away from one religious body and giving to another"; this which "many people fancy took place under Henry the Eighth or Elizabeth, simply never happened at all." [33]

Sir Robert Phillimore was born 1810, was made Judge of the Cinque ports 1855, Advocate General in admiralty in 1862, Judge of the High Court of Admiralty, and of the Arches Court, in 1867. He was Judge Advocate General, 1871-'73, and in 1880 retired from the bench. Died 1885. One of his chief works was *Ecclesiastical Law of the Church*

[33] Palmer, Earl of Selborne: *The Endowments and Establishments of the Church of England,* an address delivered Jan. 11, 1886, p. 4. This is the historical recapitulation which we have already noticed as effectively winning the assent of the famous Unitarian leader, Dr. Martineau. See page 197. See also his book, *The Catholic and Apostolic Church,* Letters to his son, 1899, pp. 138-141.

of England. His words are: "It is a legal error to suppose that a new Church was introduced at the time of the Reformation."

Appended is Oldroyd's summary of the facts upon which rights of possession and continuity rest. The statement is slightly shortened:

> "Up to the Norman Conquest the English Church was not only independent of, but also on the footing of equal terms with, the other Apostolic Churches abroad.
>
> "For 500 years the Church of England was altogether unmolested by Rome.
>
> "For the next 500 years she successfully repudiated all interference from Rome.
>
> "It should ever be remembered that the Norman Conquest was as much a crusade against the English Church as against the English nation. Mr. Freeman says, 'England's crime in the eyes of Rome was *the independence* still retained by the Church and nation.'
>
> "Step by step we find the Pope getting more and more power in the English Church.
>
> "Many were greatly scandalized that the English Church should be treated as a dependency of Rome; and again and again the nation struck a blow against such unconstitutional encroachments. Decrees and mandates of the Pope were repeatedly destroyed and contemptuously ignored by both Church and State. Taxes were refused and papal appointments set on one side.
>
> "See under dates 1070, 1114, 1115, 1226, 1235, 1239, 1245, 1247, 1256, 1343, 1365, 1420, 1427, etc.
>
> "In A. D. 1215 Archbishop Langton . . . . forced . . . *Magna Charta,* declaring that 'the Church of England shall be free.' This was confirmed by every successive sovereign from John to Henry VIII., and it is still the standard of appeal in all judicial and secular matters in England.
>
> "In 1295 an English Parliament was called together. The Parliament also showed a desire to resist papal interference in English affairs both in Church and State, and the statute books, especially of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, are full of anti-papal legislation (ref. Blackstone, *Commentaries,* IV., 8.).
>
> "In A. D. 1279 the Statute of Mortmain was passed . . . . to check the growing custom of making over lands to foreign monks under jurisdiction of the Pope; 'the dead hand.'

"In 1346 the English Parliament enacted stringent provisions against aliens. Any who brought papal letters into England were to forfeit all their possessions.

"In 1350 the first Statute of Provisors forbade interference on the part of the Pope with the Church's free elections. [And held his hands off appointments.]

"In 1353 the first Statute of Praemunire declared that the English Church should manage its own affairs.

"These three acts against the Pope's usurped patronage, taxation and appeal constitute 'the dawn of the Reformation.'

"In 1426 the Pope demanded their abolition, and when this was refused, issued bulls excommunicating the whole of the English Bishops. These bulls were burned, and the nuncio who brought them was cast into prison.

"Everything had been long ripe for a Reformation.

"It would have occurred, and in all probability would have occurred about the same period it did, had there been no Henry VIII.

"I need scarcely say that there is no Act of Parliament in the statute book which professes to establish a new Church. The vulgar statement that the Church of England was made by Act of Parliament at the time of the Reformation has no foundation in fact, nor can it be proved by any historical document." [34]

---

[34] Oldroyd: *The Continuity of the English Church.* Another legal authority for Continuity is *Authority in the Church of England,* 1906, by Gordon Crosse, M.A. (Barrister), pp. 21, 22, 257, 88, 89, 30, 67, 163, 142, 146, 74, 214-237, 167. Also the judgment of Baron Alderson in Moore and Brinckman: *The Anglican Brief,* pp. 333-335.

CHAPTER XVIII.

SOME FORGOTTEN DOCUMENTS, ROMAN AND SCOTTISH, AND SOME OTHER UNEXPECTED TESTIMONY.

I.

In 1570, Pope Pius V. declared:

> "With the fulness of apostolic power that the aforesaid [Queen] Elizabeth is a heretic . . . and that they who adhere to her are condemned . . . . that she herself too is deprived of her pretended right to the aforesaid kingdom . . . . And we command and charge all . . . . not to dare to obey her or her orders, mandates, and laws."

This was but an echo of the *Dictatus,* which probably dates just after the papacy of Gregory VII., who died in 1085. The *Dictatus* said:

> "That he [the Pope] has the power to absolve the subjects of unjust rulers from the oath of fidelity."[1]

In 1788, the four Roman Catholic vicars-apostolic who then ruled in the four districts into which English Roman Catholics were separated, with all the Roman Catholic clergy and laity in England of every note, and with all the English Roman Catholics who could be gathered at a general meeting in London in the following year, signed a Protestation. It says:

> "We have been accused of holding, as a principle of our religion, that princes excommunicated by the Pope and Council, or by authority of the See of Rome, may be deposed . . . . by their subjects.
>
> "The above-mentioned unchristianlike and abominable

[1] Ogg: *A Source Book of Mediaeval History,* 1908, pp. 262 and 264.

> position . . . . we reject, abhor, and detest . . . . as execrable and impious . . . .
>
> "We do solemnly declare that neither the Pope . . . . nor any ecclesiastical power whatever, can absolve the subjects of this realm . . . . from their allegiance to his Majesty King George III. . . . or can absolve . . . the obligation of any compact or oath whatsoever."[2]

This will be seen to be a direct contradiction of the received and accepted documents of 1087 or later, and 1570, and it is also a contradiction of some of the authorized Roman theologians. It is, however, the doctrine which has won its place in the Roman Church in America and been accepted by perhaps all American Roman Catholics, to the entire overthrow and oblivion of the Mediæval Roman Catholic doctrines of authority. The old position would be a mental monstrosity among intelligent Americans to-day. But the old position must be stated in order to understand the necessity for Elizabeth's position, and the depth of the division to-day between the English Church and Rome. Thus emerges the reason why Anglican Catholics may sometimes, yes, *must,* call themselves Protestants. They will ever protest against every survival of the old position. If, however, as now seems likely, the old position is extinct, the Protestant name becomes impossible to any Anglican Catholic.

The document of 1788 is the first Roman Catholic declaration of independence, against the former Roman position and against political interference from beyond the straits; it came twelve years after the American Declaration of Independence—against political sway from beyond the sea. Both together are pillars of the gateway to the modern world, to the age that in part has come, and in part is yet to come.

II.

As the Modern Roman Catholic can scarcely believe in the actual existence of the "abominable" documents of 1087 and 1570, so there is a document of 1826 which cuts the

[2] A. J. C. Allen: *The Protestation . . . in 1788.* London, 1897; pp. 9, 13, 37, and 42.

other way, of which few Roman Catholics have ever heard, or few others for that matter; which as an actual document of history, most persons would find as decisive as unexpected.

Lecturing in London a few years ago, Mr. G. H. F. Nye read from this document, and "it was publicly challenged by a Roman Catholic present, who could not believe it to be possible." Mr. Nye then reprinted the document from the original print through the kindness of its owner, a well-known Roman Catholic.

The history and the full text of the document and the surprise caused by it must be left as Mr. Nye's story. I will here insert an extract, the italics being retained as in the original.

In reply to a statement that British Roman Catholics had a claim to English Church property, *"a pretended right to the property of the Established Church in England,"* the document says:

> "We consider such a charge totally without foundation. We declare that we entertain no pretension to such a claim . . . . We disclaim any right, title, or pretension, with regard to the same."

This is signed by ten Roman Catholic Bishops, seven of them living in England and three in Scotland.[3]

The terms of such a document could hardly be any surprise to one well acquainted with the history of the English Church and of the English Reformation. That they are a surprise at all is due wholly to the persistent and obstinate character of the misrepresentations of history by those writers quoted in former chapters, or by the followers of a brilliant but faulty line of historians inaugurated by partisans and extended by Macaulay.

III.

It is not generally known that the highest Presbyterian authority can be found for the English Church principle of continuity.

---

[3] *The Right of the Church of England to Her Property.* London: Simpkin; no date, probably recent; cited Littledale: *Words for Truth;* in Oldroyd: *Continuity;* in Brinckman: *Methods of Romanism;* in the London *Times,* and in the American *Church Standard,* then edited by Dr. John Fulton.

It came in the form of an address from the Scottish Presbyterian General Assembly to the Lambeth Conference of Bishops in 1897. One hundred and ninety-eight Bishops were present, and on the second day of their proceedings, Tuesday, July 5th, an address was read from William Mair, D.D., moderator, offering the greetings of the Scottish Presbyterian General Assembly, and signed in its name and authority. Some of the sentences follow:

> "We recognize that you have special cause for commemorating the work of Augustine in the conversion of the King and Kingdom of Kent, inasmuch as to this work must be attributed the organization of the Church, which ultimately comprehended the entire realm of England. The distinguished prelate who will preside over your deliberations is the *successor in an unbroken* line of the first Archbishop of Canterbury; and notwithstanding many dynastic and social changes, the Anglican Church has continuously ministered the word and sacraments of Christ to the English nation and to English-speaking people throughout the world. . . . . We can thank God with you that, disengaged from the domination of the Roman See . . . . it is to-day an inheritor of all that is good and true in the centuries since . . . . its external constitution was sketched by Augustine."

IV.

The leading dissenting minister of England has taken the same view. Following the position accepted by the Unitarians, Martineau and Beard, and echoed by Dr. Mair for the Presbyterians of Scotland, the Rev. Dr. R. J. Campbell felt it advisable to say while preaching in the City Temple in June, 1908, that:

> "He loved the Church of England, and who did not who realized how closely the fabric of her life was interwoven with that of the nation? It was not true to say that a complete break with her past took place at the Reformation. . . . . The Church of England was not the creation of the state; the state was the creation of the Church."[4]

V.

It may be a contribution to this subject to set down here the opinion of certain Swedish historians; representing as

[4] Reported *Church Times*, June 17.

they do a Lutheran body of opinion combined with many features of both Protestant and independent national Church policies. Probably most Protestants would say that the Swedish Church has retained a good many features of Catholicism; and I am sure this would not be easy to deny. The Rev. G. Hammarsköld, of the Swedish Mission of the American Episcopal Church, writes under date of August 17, 1908:

> "All Swedish theologians and Church historians accept, without question, the catholicity or continuity of the Anglican branch of the Church as set forth in our own standard works. Some Swedish divines consider 'the Anglican doctrine of the Sacraments to be Reformed or Calvinistic,' but even those men agree with our own historians in regard to *successio apostolica* in the Church of England."

And the Rev. Prof. Olaf A. Toffteen of the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, writes, August 31, 1908:

> "Your inference is quite correct in regard to the views of Swedish Church historians about the Apostolic succession in the Anglican Church. In all Swedish literature, I have never seen that fact even doubted. Not having a Swedish library at hand, I can only refer you to the Church histories of Bishops Anjou and Cornelius."

VI.

A Russian layman, Nicholas Lodygensky, the former Consul General of Russia in New York, said at a Church meeting which bade him farewell on his return to his home:

> "I will explain to you how I came to love this *Ecclesia Anglicana*. . . . . My mother was a very religious person. . . . I read the Gospel in old Slavic and in English at the same time . . . . I went to my church at 8 o'clock, and at 11 to the English . . . . I learned [that] both of our Churches are Catholic. They are apostolic. They have their apostolic orders, and they are independent; without being anti-Roman, they are non-Roman. So this is the situation, and this gives the opportunity of mutual attraction and mutual interest . . . . If I were an Anglican, I should be just as happy as I am being an Easterner. I should consider that I belonged to a Church which has the entire evangelical truth, which has the apostolic orders, which has obtained and conserved its independence . . . . The *Ecclesia Anglicana* has a great mission. It is the only independent Church of the Western

> Patriarchate. . . . The Anglican communion . . . will find followers and will help those who want to remain Catholic without being subjects of one city." [5]

Even more forcible are Mr. Lodygensky's words in England at the annual "festival" of Ely Theological college; the speaker is referred to as "a promoter of the cause of reunion between the English and the Eastern Churches":

> "In the course of a most interesting speech he referred to the prayers used several times daily in the Russian Church for the union of all the faithful, and he said that in Russia they were taught that the English Church was neither Roman nor Protestant, but Catholic, and that he had verified this by experience." [6]

The Eastern Church Bishop who rules the diocese having its center at Sitka, Alaska, visited London on March 23, 1909, and days following. In the course of a visit of three days he attended four public services of the Church of England and several meetings, and at a Communion service, in his vestments as usual, he acted under the arrangements of the English Church by pronouncing the benediction.

> "The Bishop delivered an eloquent address in excellent English, and spoke, by request, of his own work in Alaska, and of the very cordial relations existing between himself and the Anglican Bishop there—Bishop Rowe. Warm applause greeted his narration of how he had arranged with him that the priests of either Church should conduct services for the members of both or either Church in the far distant stations of the mission; how they had arranged that one of the Bishops should, as far as possible, be always present in Sitka when the other was absent on visitation. When visiting the mission-stations they looked after the welfare of each other's flock and reported thereon on return. He told how they lent their churches to each other, and especially on one occasion he found a deserted Anglican church, which

---

[5] *Living Church,* Milwaukee, March 22, 1908. Most important statements are made in Stanley: *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church,* 1857, ed. of 1900, pp. [53]-[56], 2, 33, 34-49. (This book may now be obtained in *Everyman's Library* for 35 cts.); in Hore: *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church,* 1899, pp. v, 1, 2, 25; in Hore: *Student's History of the Greek Church,* 1902, pp. viii, 1, 464, 467, 474, 476, 489-492; more recently in Cole: *Mother of All Churches,* 1908, pp. 1, 2, 224-226, 234; in Davey Biggs: *Russia and Reunion,* 1908, A Translation of [Roman Catholic] Wilbois' *"L'Avenir de l'Eglise Russe,"* pp. 113-242; in Adeney: *The Greek and Eastern Churches,* Internat. Theol. Lib., ed. by Drs. Briggs and Salmond; and in Dowling: *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem,* 1909, pp. 63 and 64.

[6] *Church Times,* London, issue after the event, which was April 28, 1908.

he and Father Antony set to work to clean, summoned a congregation of Orthodox and Anglicans, who filled the church, and attended devoutly a Liturgy celebrated in English, Russian, and native. This historical occasion, he said, was a type of what would increase more and more."[7]

In view of the widespread acknowledgment of the Catholicity and continuity of the English Church, from many nations and from some of the most diligent and reputable of historical scholars, it would be difficult to discover either right or charity in the denial of it in so many of the American school and college text books.

[7] *Guardian*, issue following. Mention should also be made of the paper of a layman, Mr. Birkbeck, at the English Church Congress of 1907; of the mutual recognition of Greek and American Churchmen in 1909 at Brunswick, Ga., Claremont, Manchester, and Berlin, N. H., Willimantic, Conn., and perhaps as many as a hundred other places in the United States; of the presence of the Patriarch of Antioch at Anglican functions in July, in London; of the Greek Patriarch's visit to St. Mary's (English) Home, Jerusalem, in April; of the meeting of Greek and English Bishops in Japan in June; of Anglican services in Libau Cathedral shared by a vast congregation of English and "Orthodox," in August; of the English Bishop's visit to the Eastern authorities and the services at Halki in September, and at Phanar in October; and at Capetown, South Africa, in November.

CHAPTER XIX.

RECENT ACTION AND UTTERANCES, SHOWING THE LIVING OPINION WITHIN THE CHURCH TO-DAY.

It would be interesting to add the testimony of current events and utterances showing the powerful sense of continuity in which the Church of England lives to-day. It is incomprehensible, almost, to a new nation like ours; but we are an old people, as old as the English themselves in our main line, and possibly we can understand as a people what we cannot as a nation. Testimony to the continuity and Catholicity of the English Church is adduced in a long list of events, and it is lengthening each year. It testifies to the depth of English feeling about English Church principles which have been held and never overthrown by English and foreign scholarship. American scholarship can hardly expect in the end to diverge from English in a matter involving their own institutions; and American religious principles there are which rightly expect the state to make no dogmatic assertion in their disfavor when at the same time it is in the face of a part at least of the world's scholarship. The events and the students and the principles of today alike guarantee to the American citizen, and to the American as to the English Churchman, the right to believe without civil let or hindrance, in the religious and historical continuity and Catholicity of his Church.

We have yet to gather up the internal witness of the Church of England to her own continuity. This is the utterance called forth by events which occur from time to time,

and is official or partly official, that is, deliberate or spontaneous. It is difficult to say whether any period of time has been more crowded with apposite events than the past two years. We will, however, begin the story as far back as 1896. In September of that year the Pope of the Roman Church sent papers into England finding fault with the ordinations of the English Church. In the following February the two Archbishops of England addressed a reply in which they showed that Roman ordinations had for many years exhibited the same features as those which the Pope had criticised. They also pointed out several errors in the Papal document. This reply is addressed "To the whole Body of Bishops of the Catholic Church, from the Archbishops of England." It is a most distinct and important assertion, by the recognized leaders of the English Church, that the English Church does now and has always adhered to Catholicity in utilizing and perpetuating the original orders of the Catholic Church and defining one of them as the priesthood.[1]

In the same year with this *Reply,* a brilliant pilgrimage was made (Friday, July 1, 1897) to the supposed site of the landing of St. Augustine 1,300 years before. These visitors also gathered in the Church in which Augustine had preached, and offered prayers in which thanks were given to God for bringing home the truth of the Gospel to our English forefathers by means of Augustine's preaching; for calling Ethelbert to the knowledge of God and for admitting him in the same place into the Church; for the bravery and goodness of St. Martin, and for the same spirit of service in those called to fight under his banner. The entire proceeding is an expression of religious sameness and continuity.

On St. Andrew's Day, 604, St. Augustine consecrated his companion Justus to be the first Bishop of Rochester, and on St. Andrew's Day, 1904, the hundredth Bishop of Rochester celebrated the 1,300th anniversary, with the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London (as the successor of Mellitus, who was consecrated to London in 604) and a vast body of citizens.

[1] *Hierurgia Anglicana,* 1904, Vol. III., pp. 269-307.

The next year there was a Protestant rising in Liverpool, which has always been famed as a center of bitter feeling against Romanism. And in consequence the Bishop, Dr. Chevasse, felt it necessary to make an explanation, in the course of which he said:

> "When the Church of England shook off the yoke of Rome at the Reformation, she declared herself at once Protestant and Catholic . . . . When she gave up Roman doctrine and Roman practice she still kept what was truly primitive, and she evidenced her Catholicism by retaining the threefold ministry and the three ancient creeds, because both ministry and creeds may be proved by most certain warrants of the Holy Scripture."

This is of date about the middle of November, 1905. It will be seen that these evidences of continuity and Catholicity are not mere assertions, but are statements brought out by certain events. Assertions offered voluntarily might be evidence of doubt or suspicion when repeated without cause and with great frequency. But when falling incidentally as a part of the proceedings in public events or in defense of a position misunderstood or attacked, they become the necessary expression of a consciousness simply existing without change.

In 1906 the English people were aroused by a movement to keep the Lord's day against the growth of business and that kind of noisy amusement which overlooks our duty to God and the interest of our fellow-citizens. On Wednesday, May 9th, the Archbishop of Canterbury presided at a great demonstration in favor of the national observance of Sunday, and said: "I doubt whether I, *or any of my predecessors for a thousand years,* have ever taken part in a public meeting more remarkable." Among those present at the meeting, which adjourned with the Archbishop's blessing, were the leading dissenting Protestant ministers and the dissenting Roman Bishop Johnson; all in the character and spirit not of dissent, but of agreement. It is a natural and happy feature in the life of the mother country to see the nation's moral forces gather around the throne of the national Catholic Christianity set up by Augustine in the year of our Lord 597.

In 1907 came an American anniversary, the 300th anniversary of the landing at Jamestown in 1607. In recognition of the fact that the shipping and colonies had looked to the Bishop of London as their Bishop, the present Bishop of London visited this country. One of his first addresses was delivered to the business men of lower New York City, in old Trinity Church, and very appropriately he spoke on "stewardship." In the course of this address, the continuity of the Church was lightly touched upon as an illustration:

> "The one sentence which above all others I would say to you, a sentence as yet unlearned in London and New York, and which if adopted would cleanse the life on both sides of the Atlantic, is, Life is a stewardship, and not an ownership.
>
> "Have you ever thought why there are any rich and poor at all? That is the question I had to face in London. They asked me how I reconciled my belief in God loving all His children, with the wretched millions in East London, seemingly abandoned by both God and man. I had to face that question, and I have had to face it ever since. There is but one answer: the rich minority have what they have merely in trust for all the others. Stewardship, non-ownership, is God's command to all of us.
>
> "You are not your own. Nothing that you have is your own. We haven't learned the Christian religion if we have not learned the lesson of stewardship.
>
> "My home has been the home of the Bishops of London for 1,300 years. Suppose I should say that it was my own, and that the Bishop's income of $50,000 a year was my own. I should be called a madman. The man who thinks he owns what he has in his keeping is no less than a madman. Disregard of this trust is the cause of all the social evils of London and New York."

The attention of the Bishop was called to the fact, apropos of stewardship, that a speaker in the then recent "Liberal Religion Congress" had for some reason attacked England for "robbery of the Roman Catholic Church in the sixteenth century to endow a new Church of its own creating." This attack the Bishop mentioned in the course of his Richmond and Jamestown anniversary address:

> "The religion that was at the very back of all was the religion of the old Church of England. Now I find one or two people even in this up-to-date America a little ignorant

about ancient Church history, and I find some so absolutely in the depths of ignorance as to imagine that the Church of England began in the reign of Henry VIII. I want to say to you that the Bishops of London have sat in Fulham Palace without a single break for 1,300 years. The very frogs in the moat at Fulham know better than this, and all the jackdaws in the tower of Fulham church are astonished that up-to-date America can make such an extraordinary mistake."

Apropos of this utterance, the Bishop of Marquette wrote the following lines:

"DROP THE TALE.

"A thousand tadpoles dive and float
In quiet, mossy Fulham moat,
Who recently were much confounded,
To hear that Henry VIII. had founded
That Church, with jurisdiction wide,
Where Fulham Bishops still preside.
Alarmed, they asked the frogs and daws
If they can show sufficient cause,
Such gloomy tidings for believing.
The answer comes, and is relieving.
The daws and all their kindred rooks
Find nothing like it in the books.
They join in clamor, all assuring,
That XIII. centuries enduring
An Anglo-Saxon or a Latin
London's historic see has sat in.
And thus, with common croaks and cries,
These callow tadpoles they advise,
That lest their growth in knowledge fail,
'Twere best that they should 'drop the tail.'"

In 1908 the leaders of the Church of England invited Bishops from Ireland, Scotland, the Colonies, and the United States, along with clergy and laity representing the Bishops, to a great conference in London. The Bishops' meeting was called the Lambeth Conference; the later assembly of the whole body was called the Pan-Anglican Conference. Preparations for this meeting began before the English Church Congress of October, 1907, when some preliminary announcements were made. One of the articles called forth by the preparations for these meetings was published in the *Pall Mall Magazine,* and was reprinted in June, 1908, by the

Living Age of Boston. It is by Harold Spender, on "The Primate of All England; An Impression" of "the residing Archbishop." I will quote its closing paragraph:

> "But, after all, from the man our thoughts go back to the building—that grim, grey, crumbling pile by the Thames shore at Lambeth. Merely to live in such a building must be an inspiration. Six centuries speak from its walls. The poor efforts of the individual man are fortified by the feeling that he is but one link in an unbroken chain, one of a great succession stretching from the days of the Roman occupation. There have been intervals—times of defeat and despair—times when the Anglican Church seemed a thing of the past. That very building has been in the hands of the enemy, the furniture has been sold, the stones of its ancient hall sold as rubbish by its Puritan occupant. But what was said of France seems often more true of England, 'The more it changes, the more it is the same.' With all our talk of 'new eras,' nature is not to be hurried, especially English nature. There is the law of reversion to type, and by that law, or some other, the English people has always returned to its ancient Church just when it seemed about to leave it. All that is human dies, and churches are very human. But the grey minsters and the crumbling towers, the sound of the bells and the chant of prayers, the great offices of comfort and hope in the midst of human woe—these things clutch the heart strings and call men often back."

In connection with the Pan-Anglican congress, the *Church Quarterly Review* for July, 1908, said:

> "The Church of England . . . . was founded as an integral part of the Catholic Church more than thirteen hundred years ago. It therefore contains and represents everything which the Catholic Church could mean potentially. There is in it the fulness and richness of life which was communicated to the world by our Lord Jesus Christ when He founded the Church. Established amongst the English people, it has had a long history and has collected to itself all the traditions of the English nation. It has presented the original message. . . . . It has played a great part in the social and political history of the nation. . . . . Alterations have been made in its constitution, but . . . . everything which was not specifically changed has been preserved. That was the case in particular at the Reformation. A change undoubtedly took place; a change which some people perhaps think too great

> and others too slight; but legally, historically, theologically the Church lived on unchanged except so far as definite alterations were made, and no one can understand the Church of England except in reference to its pre-Reformation history."

The next month another event brought out a re-statement of the same position of the Anglican Church in holding continuity and Catholicity. This time it was not an event within the Church, but one pertaining to dissenters. No event among dissenters need necessarily call forth statements of the Anglican position were the dissenters careful not to get into their neighbors' field and issue an attack. As the famous Unitarian the year preceding became responsible for the attack in America, so now a leading Roman Catholic provoked a reply in England. Preparing for the Eucharistic Congress (a Buffalo paper said with the naive ignorance of the Bible and Christian history which too commonly is allowed to pass, that it "brought together eminent Eucharists from all parts of the world"), Archbishop Bourne issued a pastoral letter to the Roman Catholic people in which he refers to English Church life since the Reformation as "days of desolation, when England officially abandoned the unity of the Catholic Church." The following reply was published by the *Church Times*:

> "By Catholic Church his Grace means the Roman Church, a very much narrower society than that of the Universal Church, Eastern as well as Western. The unity of that larger body not only was not abandoned, but is asserted by us in every one of our public services. Not even Archbishop Bourne would seriously suppose that, whatever many of the worshippers in our churches may understand the words to mean, the Church of England, where it bids us affirm our belief in One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, bounds its horizon with the limits of its two Provinces of Canterbury and York. Moreover, we have a clear statement by the Church of England that it departs not even from the Church of Italy in any of the essentials of Catholic belief, but only in regard to those later conditions of Communion which Rome, on its sole authority, has imposed. It is rather a pity that Archbishop Bourne should have revived the memory of the days of persecution. We think it is just as well that we should all cry quits on that subject. The whole history of religious persecution is complicated with political

circumstances, which have to be taken into account. And if his Grace laments the state of things which was developed in the sixteenth century, he ought not to forget that it was a development. There is no effect without a cause, and the Reformation, stained as it was with evil doings, which we, as much as Archbishop Bourne, could deplore in dust and ashes, was unquestionably the outcome of that decay of religion during the Renaissance, which the Church itself did so little to arrest, and in which it was even implicated.

"The *Catholic Times* apparently addresses itself to readers who do not think for themselves and are not very well up in their history. A leaderette on the recent dedication of the new nave of Hexham Abbey endeavoured to point out the 'vital difference' between St. Cuthbert and the Anglicans, who believe they are carrying on his tradition. We learn from another part of the leader that 'the absence of the Thirty-nine Articles' in St. Cuthbert's time makes this alleged 'vital difference.' Let us grant that it is a difference, though not a 'vital' one. But what then? Could St. Cuthbert, if requested, have recited the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth? What would he have known of the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and Papal Infallibility?—doctrines, by the way, which a Romanist of to-day can only deny on pain of heresy, and yet 'the sweet ascetic hermit and unwived saint' had never so much as heard of them. There is, we believe, a Romanist ecclesiastic who calls himself Bishop of Hexham. If it comes to *'vital* differences,' the chasm between him and St. Cuthbert is infinitely wider than that between Anglicanism and the Saxon Saint. Anglicanism has neither enlarged nor contracted the Catholic Creed which St. Cuthbert believed, and which we believe."

Events calling forth utterances of similar import have followed each other in rapid succession. The next was the purchase by the Church of England of the ancient property at Glastonbury. In October, 1908, this "cradle of British Christianity, the spot hallowed by such inexpressible associations of sacred lore and history," "the place of sepulture of many kings, prelates, and saints, the home of Patrick, David, and of Dunstan," was "once more in possession of the Church of England." It had been taken by robbery under Henry VIII. in 1539, and forced from the service of religion into the use and enjoyment of private persons by the king's

gracious gift. Now again it belongs to the English Church. "It is hers by honestly paying for it, and at the same time she gets her own again."

> "The Church of England after the changes of the sixteenth century retained, not only a legal and constitutional continuity with the *Ecclesia Anglicana* of earlier ages, but the same main features of doctrine, discipline, and worship. . . . It entered into no one's mind that a new Church or a new religion was being established in this realm. The grievance of the Puritans was that it was the old Church and the old religion after all. *This reading of history is now accepted by all educated men,* and Mr. Asquith himself once in Parliament avowed it, to the dismay of many of his friends, to be his own."

It is not to be wondered at that these successive events should have called for notice at the Church Congress for the year. The Rev. Darwell Stone was one of the appointed speakers, and his paper was published in October, 1908, and deals with the historical association of vestments and ceremonial in the Church of England; the paper was read at the Church Congress:

> "In the first place, the use of the vestments and ceremonial is an outward mark of the true history and real position of the Church of England. The Church of England of to-day is the living heir of the Catholic Church in this country of the fourth century or the sixth or the eleventh or the fifteenth. It is no new body freshly formed in the days of the Reformation. The aim of the Anglican Reformers, plainly set out in their own words in the preface of the ordinal, was to continue the same ministry of Bishops, priests, and deacons which had been in the Church since the days of the Apostles; and in continuing the same ministry, to preserve the life of the same Church. Whatever was accomplished or destroyed by the storms or by the constructive movements of the period of the Reformation, there was no break or interruption in the life of the Church of England. The Church here was the same Church in the year 1662 as it had been in the year 1509. Now, no vestments, no ceremonial, could make this continuity if it did not already exist. But, supposing that it does exist, an outward sign of it may have its value, as supplying what is easily seen and known of men. Such a sign there is in the use of vestments and ceremonial which bear some general resemblance to those of an earlier time.

"It is a momentous fact for the Church of England that its life can be traced back beyond the period of the Reformation, and to the days of the Apostles themselves.

"The use of Eucharistic vestments and ceremonial is, in the third place, a witness to doctrine. It is, of course, the case that the vestments were originally a form of the dress of ordinary life, and that they were retained by the Church when no longer otherwise used. The saving or the taking or the placing of a flag on many a field of battle has been regarded rightly enough as marking the decision of great issues. In such circumstances surplice and flag have come to have a meaning altogether disproportionate to what they originally were. Eucharistic vestments and ceremonial, whatever their history, have, as a matter of fact, come to mark a doctrine. The use of them in the Church of England illustrates the continuity between the existing Church and the Church of past ages.

The next month the Bishop of Birmingham said in an address to his diocese:

"At the Reformation, the special characteristic of the Church of England was, that while retaining the ancient orders of the Catholic Church in unbroken succession, it determined to lay quite a fresh emphasis upon the teaching function of the Christian priesthood. It was held that in the later Middle Ages, at any rate, undue prominence had been given to the sacrificial functions of the priesthood. And so in the formularies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in all the formularies of the Prayer Book, this idea that the Church is to be a teaching society, the ministry a teaching office, is brought into prominence."

Coming to the year 1909 we notice first a political event. The Bill to Disestablish and Disendow the Church in Wales, and to force its separation from the unity of Canterbury, was introduced by the Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith. He acknowledges, in his speech introducing this bill, that he proposes to single out for disestablishment the four oldest dioceses of the Church, with a continuous history stretching back "some considerable time before the mission of St. Augustine" (A.D. 597). He generalizes the history of the Church in Wales "from the time of Henry II. (1154) to a time which is almost within the memory of people now living."

American people always favour disestablishment, in the

interests of freedom and equality. If the government had endeavoured to secure disestablishment alone, it would have been more in the interest of true progress. But the one feature of this legislation which the government and its religious allies of various denominations have kept always in the background is the fact that the bill seeks to strip the Church of her properties and support, and as a means to this, to break the Welsh Church away from the English Church. Of the three issues involved, disestablishment alone is spoken of in this country; the taking of property and the breaking of unity are kept in the background. Only English laws can conceive justice or find precedent for robbing a living and active Church of her own, or for forcing apart administrative districts which wish to remain together. Such law as this is not in accord with American ideas of religious freedom.

It is necessary to explain this in order to understand why there have been in 1909 so many public utterances in behalf of the Catholic continuity of the Church of England. Some of the events of the year—notably the Pageant of June—were well on the way before the bill was introduced. So were others of the earlier events which we will now consider.

The first event of the year was on January 26th. It was the enthronement or placing in his official seat of the new Archbishop of York, who had been previously consecrated Bishop (in 1901). He has been serving some years as Bishop, assisting in a part of "greater" London, and there is of course no consecration needed to pass to the work of an Archbishop, which is simply the work of a Bishop, after all the largeness of the title. He is announced as the *eighty-third* Archbishop, the eighty-ninth Bishop for York. He takes the oath on the ancient Anglo-Saxon copy of the Gospels in Latin used from the time of Canute. He takes his seat on the old chair of Richard III., used for 600 years for the Archbishops until Magee and Maclagan got a safer chair; but this latest and youngest of Archbishops must have back the old chair again. From the steps before the altar, Archbishop Lang, the most worthy son of a distinguished Presbyterian professor, speaks his first words as Archbishop:

"My brothers, right reverend and reverend brethren, and dear people of God. It is very hard for a man to speak whose whole heart craves for silence; yet I cannot but thank you for the encouragement and the help of your presence and your prayers to-day, and I can only try for a few minutes to share with you some of the thoughts which press upon the soul at such a time as this. It may be that by sharing with you these thoughts we may be better able to use the time of silent prayer which will follow when my words are done, that we may then—because we have thought together—pray together with greater oneness and warmth. We look first of all backward. We look backward upon the long vista of the centuries during which the mercy of God has led and guided this ancient Church of England. At the far end of it we see forms which we cannot recognize reminding us of an ancient British Church. We discern the figure of Paulinus laying in his wooden church upon this place the seed out of which so great a tree was to grow. It is to me not a form of speech, but a most moving and penetrating thought that I am set in this place, the eighty-ninth Bishop since Paulinus. It is a truth of the spirit, if not of the letter, that this chair comes down to us from the days of the Northumbrian kings. Certainly it has been used for at least six hundred years. The copy of the Gospels which was tendered to me for the customary oath comes down to us from Anglo-Saxon days, itself a symbol of the one blessed and everlasting Gospel, committed through all these centuries to the Church of Jesus Christ. We naturally think in memory to-day of those who, during all these ages, have inspired and ruled the Church of this See and Province.

"It is to me at least natural to remember with special thankfulness those missionaries who came to this North of England from the island of the West still breathing in its Western air the fragrance of the saints, and giving to us an example and a symbol of Apostolic preaching of the Word. We remember great prelates such as Walter de Gray, a stalwart servant of the Church and State; or Richard Scrope, who asked to be allowed to unite his own sufferings with the wounds of his Redeemer; or John Dolben, who is honoured as the Preaching Bishop, who spoke the word among the villages of Yorkshire; or John Sharp, meditating upon the word amid his garden, and speaking from his heart to his people; or to come to later times, fresh in the memory of many here present, we remember William Thomson, strong, resolute, contending as an athlete for the faith before the workpeople of Sheffield or Hull. We think of the

brilliant orator taken from this diocese before his powers could be used. But most of all, chiefest of all, we think of one still living—William Dalrymple Maclagan. He has laid down his rule with all that quiet and soldierly dignity, that spiritual grace with which he discharged it. I beg of you in the silence that will follow to commend him as he passes to the eventide of his life to the love of God, and to pray that the peace of God which passeth all understanding may guide his heart and mind through Jesus Christ our Lord. Through all these centuries, by the means of ministries so varied, the Lord Jesus Christ has preserved the witness of His Church. It has mingled at every stage with the life of the nation, inspiring it sometimes with its own message, sharing with it sometimes the corruption of the time, and yet always distinct in its origin, in its mission, in its purpose.

"We must try to win for the Lord Jesus Christ this English people, so dear to this English Church. We must never cease to work or to pray for the time when those who own His name, but are separated from our Communion, may be gathered together again in oneness of spirit, and it may be of body. We must never forget that perhaps the greatest privilege of our ancient history may be that we may be permitted to hand on this message to the new worlds with their new destinies that are now arising across the seas."

Speaking to the huge congregation in the nave from a raised dais near the Choir gates, the Archbishop said:

"Dear reverend brethren and people of God, within the choir an unworthy servant of Jesus Christ has been set upon a chair to rule in this ancient diocese and province. The very sound of the words brings home to him a fresh sense of the greatness of the responsibility and of his manifold needs of the gracious strength of God. I beseech you to offer prayer for him in the moments of silence which will shortly come. I know that you have here in the nave joined in the offering of prayer and praise, but you cannot have heard the words which I spoke to those within the choir. I ask you to share in the thoughts which must come into the mind of one called to be the eighty-ninth Bishop or Archbishop of York since Paulinus. But now, as I face this great multitude of people, I feel surely as a general called at a critical time to take command must feel when, for the first time, he comes in sight of an army. Beyond the great west door we see the field of battle. The city, the village, the centers of commerce and of labour, that great land of human life—personal, social, industrial, national,

imperial—must be won by the Church of Jesus Christ for its Lord and Master. My word to you, clergy and people, is one which I fain would believe God speaks to us all on this memorable day. Let us go forth from beyond these doors with fresh aspirations and hopes and faith, and with a fresh outpouring of the Spirit of the Lord, to take our place in that great campaign."

The next event is in Denmark. It is Sunday, March 21st. It is in a Church consecrated in the year 1081, rebuilt within a century; rebuilt again in 1268 after a fire, and this time consecrated by the English Bishop of Winchester. In acknowledgment of this fact, the present Bishop of Winchester is invited to this reopening in 1909. He is unable to attend, but sends the vice chancellor of Cambridge University, who is a great student of Danish affairs, who walks robed in the procession with the Danish Bishop in his cope of flowered cloth of gold to the altar lighted with eight candles. English continuity is said to mean the same thing in Denmark as it does in England.

April 21, 1909, was celebrated in the Church of England as the 800th anniversary of the death of St. Anselm, "the greatest of the Archbishops of Canterbury." His successor of to-day kept the day, joining in an act of thanksgiving to God for his life and work. Canon Mason delivered a course of lectures on the man Anselm and his times.

The next event was the annual meeting of the London Diocesan Conference. The meeting was opened with the Bishop's address, in the course of which he recommended the Pageant as a cure for a great deal of existing ignorance—"astounding ignorance"—about the English Church, Speaking of the disendowment bill against the Welsh Church, and the attempt to sever by legal act the Welsh Church from the unity of the English, the Bishop said:

"And I cannot conclude better than in the noble words of Archbishop Benson, which I heard myself at the Rhyl Congress:

"'But you, who are our eldest selves, fountain of our episcopacy, the very designers of our sanctuaries, the primeval British dioceses, from whom our very realm derives its only title to be called by its proudest name of Great Britain, I come from the steps of the chair of Augustine, your

younger ally, to tell you that, by the benediction of God, we will not quietly see you disinherited.'"

At the same conference there was a resolution presented by two distinguished laymen asserting that alteration of the Book of Common Prayer would be unwise; they would stand against any attempt to modify the vestments especially used for the celebrating priest at Holy Communion. Mr. Riley said:

> "Why do we attach such importance to them? Because (1) They link us on in the most solemn act of Christian worship with the whole of historical Christendom. (2) They are a standing witness to the claim of the Church of England to be the ancient Church of this land, with a substantial continuity of doctrine."

This is a significant incident. For it is often represented that sacred vestments are merely evidence of ministerial fussiness. It will be seen from the above, by those who have not seen it from knowledge and usage, that the vestment is a matter of history and of regular requirement, as well as of that reverence in the worship of God which is highly valued by the devout and thoughtful laity.

On the 6th of May an incident of a related kind took place in the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. This is the body that includes the dioceses, and is therefore a higher body than a diocesan conference such as that which we have just noticed. It happened that the Dean or head priest of one of the Cathedrals had asserted with characteristic English independence that for reasons of personal preference he felt satisfied that he might disobey the directions of the Church in regulating vestments. This set off Canon Knox-Little on the value of Catholic continuity:

> "The Church of England was not worth a brass farthing to him unless it was the Church of Christ of all ages. If it was only founded by that enigmatical person, Henry VIII., he had no interest in it. To talk of three hundred years was nothing to him—he wanted the practice of twenty centuries. If he thought it was the law of the Church of England that he should break continuity with the past, wild horses would not have led him to take orders in the Church of England."

So the *Guardian* of May 26th, in direct contradiction

to another published statement made outside the Church, said: "The Church of England did not originate with the Reformation."

Another event in this thickening list occurred on June 9th, transferred for convenience from June 5th. It was the 1,154th anniversary of the martyrdom of St. Boniface, who has the distinction of being written up for the modern American as few saints have been. He is the hero of Dr. Van Dyke's charming story *The First Christmas Tree.* St. Boniface was born in Crediton, and the anniversary of the martyrdom coincided with the one thousandth anniversary of the consecration of the first Bishop of Crediton. The Archbishop of Canterbury was present, and the Bishop of Exeter said it was the first Archbishop who had visited Crediton in a thousand years. In the sermon, the Bishop of Bristol said:

"Seeing that you men and women of this ancient diocese are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, consider what manner of men and women ye should be in all godly confidence and truth." And then, says a witness, we are singing a great *Te Deum,* with thoughts of twelve hundred years ago. "We were worshipping God in the same place that gave birth to St. Boniface, and our faith was the same."

The next event will lead us to consider how remarkable it is that persons in no way concerned therewith are able to let themselves intrude into making unacceptable names and descriptions of the Anglican Church. The offender this time is the Lord Mayor of Cork. For some reason he saw fit to describe her members as "Non-Catholic Christians," in a public and partly official way. It is sufficient for our purpose to record that for such a public and official expression he was "taken promptly to task by the Bishop of Cork."

"The English Church Pageant" was timed as though inspired by the succession of other events bearing on the same subject; as a matter of fact its projection antedates most of them. Originally planned in February, 1908, for Brighton, it was summoned to London by the Bishop, who opened the grounds at Fulham for the occasion. This was on suggestion of the Archbishop of Canterbury. There is nothing lacking to make the main lines of the "Pageant" an official

arrangement, for which the leaders of the Church assume responsibility. The Rev. Walter Marshall, the projector, said that its real object was educational, and this was at the bottom of all the work. It is curious how little people know about Church history, and it is their hope to be able to teach something in this direction. This shortcoming of the English people is largely on account of the neglect of sufficient study of the subject in schools. The headmaster of Eton had recently said to him that of all his boys going out into the world hardly one knew anything of the history of the Church. This was a strange reflection when they remember how closely the history of the Church is bound up with the history of the nation.

This was taken up by the Bishop of London, who said to his diocese:

"I believe immensely in teaching through the eye. . . . I do hope and believe that the pageant will do something to remove the astounding ignorance of so many Church people about their own Church and to make us all prouder than ever of the inheritance of our fathers."

The ignorance of history which the officials of the Pageant complained of became a text for the press. One strong editorial said:

> ". . . If Church history be taught in the right way, it will aim less at equipping pupils with ready made judgments than with the material whence they may form judgments of their own. However simple in character, there is no reason why it should be unscientific in spirit. A new spirit, and vast stores of fresh information, have influenced the study of ecclesiastical history within the last twenty years or so. Research has modified many conclusions that were deemed incontestable, has changed our estimate of characters, has shown to be baseless stories which for long were received without question. And the case for our Church is strong enough to stand upon its own merits. Lectures and books about Church history of the 'popular' order are apt to be extraordinarily inaccurate and behind modern knowledge. It is not teaching of this type that we should wish to find installed in our leading schools. Granted, however, that the teaching is of the right kind, that it is scientific, that it is impartial, that it is based upon the best authorities, we can claim that it is as essential on educational grounds as it is desirable from our

standpoint of English Churchmen. To say that Church history has been neglected in school teaching is to state but half of the truth. It has been wilfully and deliberately ignored. The whole story of the Middle Ages is set in a false perspective, and truth is tampered with, because writers of schoolbooks have deliberately concealed the working of the Church as a great factor in the shaping of the state and the development of our people. The man who attempts to teach English history, while saying as little as possible of the monastic system, of our varying relations with the Papacy, of the struggle with Puritanism, of the work and influence of such men as Anselm, Becket, Parker, Laud, and Bancroft (to pick a few names at random) is not failing chiefly because he does nothing for intelligent Churchmanship, but because he is falsifying history, because, while professing to explain certain results, he conceals some of the chief factors which brought those results to pass.

"What will be the immediate effect of the spectacle which is to be presented so suitably in the grounds of the ancient Thames-side manor-house of the Bishops of London—for Fulham Palace is itself almost an epitome of English Church history? Will the Pageant unsubstantially fade, and leave not a wrack behind? The Fulham Pageant is but the coloured frontispiece to the Book of the Church of England which it is meant to illustrate—not merely the book of the past, but that of the present and the days that are coming. It is to be presumed that those who place it before our eyes are not doing so in a merely antiquarian spirit. Rather, they are saying: 'This is the living institution which carries its vigour and its witness forward in ourselves. This is the old historic Catholic Church of England, of which we now are the representatives.'

"The purpose of the movement which we call the Reformation was a purified Catholicism. The Continental Calvinists were appealing *from* the Catholic Church; the Church of England was appealing *to* it. After the Elizabethan anarchy she emerged the Church of Andrewes and Herbert. After her overthrow by the Puritans she recovered her apostolic system purged and sealed with the blood and suffering of her noblest. After her Babylonish captivity of a century and a half from 1688 she righted herself and stood forth once more before England as God's ambassador. But all these conflicts have left their scars and losses and confusions behind. There is enough which we could wish bettered to hold us from bragging, as though the true 'ideal of a Christian Church' had

> been steadily and consistently pursued by our fathers for the last four hundred years and by ourselves. But that is not the present question. The question is whether what we practically *desire* the Church of England to be, and are endeavouring to make her, is in the main what St. Aidan and King Alfred and St. Anselm and King Henry VI. and King Charles I. and the Seven Bishops and Keble and Pusey tried to keep and make her."

Without taking time to record the impressive utterances brought forth by the events that follow in the same year, I will simply place here the fact that the English Church belief in Continuity and Catholicity has been restated by the chief official speakers on June 17th at the 600th anniversary of St. Botolph's Church and Town; on June 22d, at the 1,000th anniversary of the Diocese of Wells; on the same day when Glastonbury Abbey was formally "restored to the Church of England"; on June 29th, at the 800th anniversary of Southwell Minster Church; on June 14th and 15th, at the 50th anniversary of the English Church Union; in September, at the Carlisle Diocesan Conference, and at the Bishop of Worcester's Diocesan Visitation; on October 19th, at the rededication of Selby Abbey, by the Archbishop of York; in the same month by several speakers at the annual Church Congress; on October 29th, by the Bishop of London, at the opening of Bishops' College, Cheshunt; on November 11th, by the Archbishop of York in an address at York; by the Bishop of Exeter at the 650th anniversary of a church in Powderham, on November 28th.

Impossible as pageants and millennial anniversaries may be in America, there is one inconspicuous, almost unnoticed, event in this country which shows that the American descendants of the English Church are of one mind in accepting the practical consequences of Catholic continuity. There is no exception amongst "Low" or "Broad" Church. None of these ever asks an outside minister to celebrate the Eucharist at the Church altar. None of them appears without the surplice, which, although never at all demanded by rule, is accepted by all as a tacit expression of ordination to the reverent service of God. None of them, whatever his study theories, ever fails to seek ordination for candidates

under his charge, and none of them ever substitutes prayers, however solemn, for the actual laying on of hands to confer orders. No group of them ever raised a man to the office of a Bishop by the laying on of hands of a lower order. Thus Catholic Continuity stands to-day accepted with unanimity in the American daughter of the English Church. One overt act of repudiation of these rules and conventions would at once bring the question of continuity to the test of decision. Why is it that no such act has ever occurred? Because the entire Anglican Church virtually accepts tactual succession from the Apostles, and Catholic continuity. The strongest of all evidences from within that the Anglican Churches accept Catholic continuity is the unquestioned obedience of all to the Anglican method of perpetuating the Catholic priesthood.

CHAPTER XX.

CONCLUSION.

To the Science of History belongs the final determination of every question of fact where evidence exists upon which reason can operate. History is an inclusive science and can take events of the past almost without limit where there is evidence to be sifted and weighed, and movements to be shown as related. History determines both the value of the interest of any fact to the minds of men of today, and its effect, its bearing upon present life and conditions; and in accordance with her finding in these tests, history decides whether it may be admitted to the record.

Historians with singular unanimity have decided upon the interest of the English Reformation to the American people, have decided affirmatively on the question of its value to impart a better understanding of existing conditions, and have decided that its main lines and movements must be admitted to the record.

There is no such unanimity when we come to historians' estimate as to what the English Reformation accomplished or achieved. There is no scientific determination in a matter too recent to exhibit its final results. Whether continuity was retained, whether continuity is of essential value, whether it is merely useful, or a real hindrance: these questions have never yet been closed by scientific demonstration. There are certain facts which history may and must contribute, but the conclusion up to the present time remains a perplexity to the divided historians, and a question of spiritual and religious division and difference.

We may easily reach an explanation why the historians have differed in these matters which history refuses to determine.

The dawn of the modern science of history was at a moment of intense Protestant prejudice and at a reigning moment of religious indifference. Currency, not unchallenged but yet extensive, was given to views unfavorable to the English Church and her own idea of her continuity—unfriendly to her documentary development and conservation, even unwilling to attend to her most formal public utterances. This is an attitude unworthy of historians, but we have shown that it exists, more particularly in this country. The ultimate fate of historians of this type must be their repudiation by the more consistent disciples of history as a science. In some notable cases, such repudiation has been most successfully accomplished, though the verdict and sentence have not yet reached the popular ear.

Historical literature of prejudice and unfriendliness was followed by a literature of reassertion, a positive and constructive effort to reëstablish the Church of England in the minds of the people at her own valuation. This literature worked both by protest against prejudice and by force of conviction in favor of the continuity. This literature was in harmony with the first literature of the English Reformation, although it has been characterized by some short sighted writers as "reactionary." It came forth in a great and steady stream.

No balance has been struck between the extremes and varieties of view, to effect the closing of the main question. The science of history still leaves the matters of continuity, orders, priesthood, catholicity, unsettled, and with good authorities on both sides. The law has for a long time shown a strong tendency to close the question in favor of the documents of the English Church. The Puritan majority in America has taken up the side which has best served its purpose, and this has been diligently pushed by Roman Catholic ecclesiastics. The religious element in the question has been known to carry men as far as the misreading of history. There are occasional indications that unfairness brings re-

venge in its train by the occasional loss of one who was intended to be a partisan disciple.

Still, with these transgressors of the laws of history allowed for, the matter of continuity in the English Church has become, or rather it is now seen to be what from the beginning it really was, a religious question in which the only attitude the state can take is one allowing freedom of conviction and a variety of views among citizens. The vast output of literature on the subject, both in England and in this country, proves that it is not a matter of indifference. The text book and the teacher should be impartial in their expressions, either stating both sides fairly, or simply certifying the class that there are two sides, each of which has reasonable arguments and a numerous and intelligent following.

Such a simple expectation of simple justice is inevitable, right, and not only possible but easy of realization in a state like ours, where people are trained to respect the convictions and feelings of others.

When prejudice is seen to have existed and to have been spread; when it is determinedly put aside; when room is made for the first time for the first favorable view of a side which has been made locally unpopular; when an attempt has been made to secure knowledge as well as to do justice; then, and not until then, will many minds which have been unduly alienated from their Mother Church, turn with hope and love to the Catholic Church of the English-speaking peoples.

INDEX.

A

Aalborg, Nielsen, Bishop of, 109.
Abbot, *Makers of History,* 119.
Abbott, Dr. Lyman, 123.
Abbott-Smith, *Church in England,* 234.
Abolishing the Mass, see Mass.
Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, Creighton, 216.
Abraham, *Position of the Eucharist in Sunday Worship,* 67, 233, 234.
Abstract Articles Magna Charta in school texts, 142.
Accumulation of Faith, Phillips Brooks, 6.
Act abolishing diversity of opinions, 122.
Act of Supremacy, 147, 158, 179,
Acton, 7, 19, 36, 41, 50, 80, 84, 86, 87, 90, 91, 94, 95, 100, 103, 104, 105, 107, 109, 188, 215, 216, 238, 250.
Adams and Stephens, *Select Documents,* 147.
Adams, Prof. G. B., 50, 110, 138.
Adelphi College, Brooklyn, 173.
Adeney, *Greek and Eastern Churches,* 266.
Advanced History of Eng., Ransome, 191.
Age of Eliz., Creighton, 203.
A. L. A. Catalog., 115, 218.
Alaska, Russian Bishop in, 266.
Alban, 138.
Albano; Benedict, Bishop of, 87.
Albany, N. Y., 177.
Alexander, VI., Pope, 87.
Allegheny, Pa., 180.
Allen, *Protestation of 1788,* 110, 262.
Alma College, Mich., 182, 183.
Alterations of religious belief, 11.
Ambassador of Christ, by Card. Gibbons, 89.
American Church Hist., Coleman, 116.
American Historical Association, 8.
American History, Montgomery, 167.
American History, linked to Engl., 7-9, 251, 252, 288.
American Liberties, 4.
American Library Association, 115, 218.
American Nation, The, Ed. Prof. A. B. Hart, 154.
American Normal Readers, Harvey, 184.
Analysis of Engl. Ch. Hist., Pinnock and Southard, 233.
Ancient and Modern Theol. Lib., 144, 145.
Ancient Ch., Lessons from the, 5-7.
Ancient History, West., 180.
Anderson, John J., 138.
Andrewes, Bishop, 61.
Andrews, Charles M., 139.
Anglican Ch., the name, 30, 142-144, 147.
Anglicanism, 143.
Anglican Reformation, Clark, Ed. by Dr. Fulton, 133.
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 147.
Anjou, Swedish Historian and Bishop, 267.
Annales of Eng., Godwin, 69.
Anne Boleyn, name use for Controversy, 104.
Anniversaries: (1300th) Landing St. Aug., 269; (1300th) 1st Bishop, Roches., 269; (300th) settlement Jamestown, 271; in Denmark, 281; (800th) St. Anselm, 281; (1154th) St. Boniface, Martyrdom, 283. Others, 286.
Annotated B. of C. Prayer, Blunt, 213.
Anselm, S., 45, 52, 144, 159, 281.
Antioch College, Ohio, 141.
Apology for the C. of Eng., Jewel, 69.
Archb. Cranmer, Pollard, 200.
Archb. Parker, Kennedy, 205.
Archbishops of Canterbury, 35, 45, 46, 52, 61, 210; see Cranmer, Laud.
Archbishop of York, 278.
Armada, the Spanish, 34, 187.
Armour Institute, 142.
Arnold, Matthew, 49.
Articles of Religion, 55.
Asquith, Prime Minister, 242, 277.

Athenæum, The, 25.
Atheism, Aiding in Russia, 103.
Augsburg Confession, 77.
Augusta, Georgia, 156.
Augustana College, Illinois, 183.
Augustine, first Archb. of Canter., 45, 52, 177, 264,
Aunt Charlotte's Stories of Engl., C. M. Yonge, 184.
Austin, Texas, 180.
Authority, Ideas of, 164, 180, 181, 261, 262.
Authority in the Ch. of Eng., Gordon Grosse, 260.

B

Bagehot, Walter, 27.
Baker University, 142, 173, 183.
Baltimore, Lord, 97.
Baltimore, Maryland, 142, 162, 165, 170, 177.
Barnes, *General History,* 140.
Bartholomew St., Massacre of, 94, 97, 105.
Bates College, Maine, 182.
Battle Abbey, Charter, 156.
Bayeaux Tapestry, 171.
Baylor Univ., Texas, 173.
Bayne, Peter, *Essays in Biography and Criticism,* 23.
Beacon Lights of History, Lord, 118.
Beard, Hibbert Lect. on the Ref., 133, 196.
Beard, Prof. of Columbia U., 50, 122.
Beckett, W. H., 198.
Bede, 146.
Beeching's *Francis Atterbury,* 27.
Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes, Duchesne, 86, 87.
Bellevue College, Nebraska, 141.
Beloit College, Wisconsin, 172.
Benedict, Bishop of Albano, 87.
Benedict College, 165, 169.
Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, 103.
Benson, Archbishop, 281.
Bevan, *Protraits of the Archbishops of Canterbury,* 233.
Bible, 13, 31, 32, 33.
Bigg, Prof., *Wayside Sketches,* 95.
Bill of Rights, in *Montgomery's Eng. Hist.,* 180.
Bilson, Bishop, 79.
Binghamton, N. Y., 142.
Birkbeck, on the Eastern Church, 267.
Birmingham, Alabama, 156.
Birmingham, Bishop of (Gore), 229, 277.
Birrell, Augustine, 243.
Bishop, Edmund, 105.
Bishops, Methods of Selecting, 145, 147.
Bishopthorpe School, S. Bethlehem, Pa., 173.
Blackburn University, 172.
Blackstone, 99.
Blackwoods Magazine, 25, 26.
Blount (or Blunt) Elizabeth, 91.
Blunt, 83, 211.
Body of Christ, The, Gore, 229.
Boleyn, Anne, 104.
Boniface, Saint, 283.
Bonn Conference, 107.
Book of the Ch., Southey's, 42.
Boston *Advertiser,* 117.
Boston, Mass., 138, 140, 156, 162, 168, 169, 172, 183.
Bossuet, French Bishop, 71,
Boswell's *Life of Johnson,* Hill's Ed., 22.
Bothwell, Divorced to Marry,
Bourn, Priest of, 66.
Bourne, Prof. H. E., 140, 141.
Bourne, R. C., Archbishop, 274.
Bowdoin College, Maine, 138, 139, 183.
Breen, Fr., 110.
Brewer, *The Reign of Henry VIII.,* 86, 91, 104.
Bribery of Cardinal Wolsey, 104.
Bridgeport, Ct., 142.
Brief Hist. of Ancient, Medieval and Modern Peoples, Barnes, 140.
Brief Hist. of the Nations, Fisher, 131.
Briggs, *Church Unity,* 249; Ed., 266
Brigham Young College, Utah, 162.
Bright, J. Franck, 54, 62, 187.
Bright, Prof. William, *Waymarks,* 108.
British Nation, Wrong, 181.
Brockton, Massachusetts, 139, 142, 165, 170.
Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, 183.
Brooklyn, N. Y., 162, 165.
Brooks, Bishop Phillips, 6.
Brown, P. Hume, *History of Scotland,* 247.
Browne, *The 39 Articles,* 128.
Browne, Bishop of Bristol, 230.
Browne, Sir Thomas, *Religio Medici,* 65.
Browning, Mrs., *The Forced Recruit,* Lecky's ref. to, 92.
Brunswick, Georgia, Greek Ch. at, 267.
Bryce, Ambassador, 48, 49, 54, 237.
Buchtel College, Ohio, 173.
Buckingham, Duke of, Murder by Henry VIII., 91.
Buffalo, N. Y., 156, 162, 165, 169.
Bull, Bishop, 70, 79.
Burgon, Dean, *Lives of Twelve Good Men,* 21.
Burke, 19.
Burlington, Vt., 162, 165, 169.
Burn, *Ecclesiastical Law,* 255.
Burn, *Handbooks of Eng. Ch. Hist.,* 233.
Burnet, Bishop, on The Reformation, 16, 69, 82.

Butler, A. A., *How Shall We Worship God?* 67.
Butler Univ., Indianapolis, 172, 182.

C

Calderwood, *History of the Kirk of Scotland,* 246.
Caldwell (and Persinger) *Source Hist. of the U. S.,* 184.
Callixtus II., Pope, 161.
Calvin's advice, 66, 195.
Calvinism, Froude, *Essay on,* 31.
Cambridge (Eng.), *Historical Series,* 247.
Cambridge Modern Hist., 110, 191.
Cambridge (Mass.), 165.
Camden, N. J., 139, 170.
Cameos from English Hist., C. M. Yonge, 52.
Campbell, Rev. R. J., 264.
Campeggio, Cardinal, 90, 97, 103, 113, 117.
Canadian Church, The, 232.
Candle of the Lord, sermons by Phillips Brooks, 6.
Canterbury, Archbishops of; Benson, 281. Davidson, 235. See Cranmer, Laud, etc.
Canterbury Cathedral, 269, 281.
Carlyle, Thomas, 19, 21, 27, 36, 37, 42.
Carpenter, Boyd, Bishop of Ripon, 116.
Carroll College, Wisconsin, 173.
Carter, Canon T. T., 67, 79, Ed. of *Undercurrents of Church Life in the 18th Century,* 72.
Carthage, Council of, 398; supposed degree of, 153.
Catalogue, Bibliographical, A. L. A., 115, 218.
Catalogue of the Bishops of England, Godwin, 69.
Catechism, Ken on the, 69, 207.
Catena Patrum, 68, 72.
Cathedrals, Handbook to, Mrs. Van Renssalaer, 119.
Catholic and Apostolic Church, Sir R. Palmer, 258.
Catholic Encyclopedia, 90, 107.
Catholic Principles, Westcott, 74.
Catholicism, 131.
Cedarville College, Ohio, 165.
Celibacy, 51, 85.
Central College, Missouri, 141.
Central Univ., Kentucky, 141.
Century Book of Facts, 126.
Century Cyclopedia of Names, 126.
Century Dictionary, 123.
Ceremonial of the English Ch., Staley, 233.
Chambers, Rev. T. W., 128.
Channing (and Higginson) 123.
Chapuys, Ambassador, 30.
Charles I., 14, 199.
Charles V., 30, 59.
Charleston College, South Carolina, 139.
Charlotte Mary Yonge, by Mrs. Romanes, 52.
Chautauqua Series, 120.
Chelsea, Mass., 139, 156, 169, 176.
Chester, Bishop of, 156.
Chevasse, Bishop of Liverpool, charge of, 270.
Cheyenne, Wyoming, 142, 156.
Cheyney, Prof., 132, 141-156.
Chicago, 142, 156.
Chicago Univ., 172.
Child's History of Eng., Dickens, 43.
"Christ, have Mercy," Green's test, 53.
Christian Worship, Duchesne, 85.
Ch. and State in Eng., Abraham, 234.
Church and the Ministry, Gore, 229.
Ch. and the Nation, Creighton, 205.
Church Congress, 1908, 266; 1909, 286; Rhyl, 281.
Church, Dean, 74.
Church Eclectic, 232.
Ch. Historical Society, 227.
Church History, Kurtz, 112, 145,
Ch. Hist. of Scotland, 246.
Ch. History, 6.
Ch. in Eng., Abbott, Smith, 234.
Ch. in Eng. from William III. to Victoria, Hore, 213.
Church Law, Whitehead, 256.
Church of Eng., Rev. R. E. Roberts, 233.
Church of Scotland, Past and Present, Story, 248.
Church Principles, Gladstone, 238.
Church Quarterly Review, 143, 181, 273.
Church Standard, The, 263.
Church, The, Its Ministry and Authority, Darwell Stone, 233.
Church Times, London, 22, 37, 221, 222, 232, 264, 266, 274, 284.
Church Unity, Briggs, 181
Church Universal Series, 235.
Churches, Russian, attendance, 103.
Churches Separated from Rome, Duchesne, 85.
Cincinnati, Ohio, 160.
Cincinnati, Univ. of, 142.
Civil Equality, principle of, 287.
Civilization During the Middle Ages, Adams, 50, 110, 138.
Clark, Prof. William, 131.
Clarke's *Thomas Ken,* 71
Clement VII., Pope, immoral suggestion of, 113.
Clement VII., 89, 103.
Clergy, English, in literature, science, and history, 235.
"Clergyman," Word with connotations inclusive or exclusive of "priest," 55, 119, 141, 147, 154.
Cleveland, Ohio, 138, 165.
Coe College, Iowa, 172.
Colby, Prof., 128.

Cole, *Mother of All Churches,* 266.
Coleman, Bishop of Delaware, 116.
Collections and Recollections, G. E. Russell, 108, 109.
Colleges, Number and influence in America, 136.
College of the City of New York, 139, 162, 169, 170, 172.
College Text Books, Distribution, 136.
Collins, Prof., Bishop of Gibraltar, 22, 37, 84, 100, 110, 152, 192, 227.
Colorado, Movement for impartial instruction, 9, 10.
Colorado College, 142, 165.
Colorado Springs, 165.
Columbia Univ., 141.
Columbus, Georgia, 156, 170.
Columbus, Ohio, 170, 177.
Coman and Kendall, 156.
Coming Catholicism, 131.
Commentaries, Blackstone, 99.
Compendium of Ch. Hist., Zenos, 113.
Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge, Jackson, 128.
Confirmation, Field, 233.
Confirmation of the Charters, 166.
Congregational, 131.
Connecticut, 10, 22.
Constantine, Emperor, calls Nicene Council, 108.
Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution, Gardiner, 199.
Constitutional Hist. of Eng., Hallam, 14, 39, 62.
Constitutional Hist. of Eng., Stubbs, 5.
Constitutional Hist. of the Ch. of Eng., Makower, 111.
Continuity asserted, 13, 45, 46, 51, 52, 56, 57, 59, 60, 66, 68, 70, 71, 74, 76, 123, 128, 133, 134, 135, 196, 197, 198, 244, 253-260, 264-287.
Continuity of Creed; see *Creed.*
Continuity of Order, 13, 44, 112, 153, 189, 243, 244, 252, 287.
Continuity of Possessions at the Reformation, Browne, 230.
Continuity of the Eng. Ch., Oldroyd, 230, 260.
Continuity of the Holy Cath. Ch. in Eng., Browne, 230.
Controversy, religious, not for the classroom, 3, 4.
Convocation of Canterbury, 282.
Coop, Rev. J. O., 208.
Copenhagen, Univ. of, Nielson, Prof. of Ecc. Hist., 109.
Cork, Lord Mayor *vs.* Bishop of, 283.
Cornelius, Bishop, Swedish Historian, 267.
Cornell Coll., Iowa., 139.
Cornell Univ., New York, 139, 141, 182.
Cornhill Magazine, 26, 36, 153.
Cotner Univ., Nebraska, 183.
Council of Trent, by Froude, 30, 35.
Councils of the Ch., 127.
Coupe, Rev. C., S. J., 67.
Covington, Ky., 165.
Cranmer, Abp., 22, 33, 37, 45, 46, 52, 54, 55, 73, 75, 82, 103, 118, 131, 175.
Cranmer, Thomas, and the Eng. Ref., Pollard, 200.
Creed: whether it was altered:
  Affirmative, 11, 18, 34, 55, 80, 114, 118, 122, 141, 150, 161, 168, 169, 170, 171, 187.
  Negative, 31, 47, 51, 52, 60, 62, 67, 68, 69, 70, 76, 106, 113, 118, 121, 130, 140, 233, 234, 238.
Creeds, The Three, Gibson, 234.
Creighton, Mandell, 87, 202 to 205, 216.
Cromwell, Thomas, 32.
Crosse, Gordon, *Authority in the Ch. of Eng.,* 260.
Croydon Parish Church, 950 years old, 275.
Crucifix, 65.
Cunningham, *History of Scotland,* 246.
Cur Deus Homo, St. Anselm, 144.
Cuthbert, Saint, 278.
Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theol, and Eccles. Literature, McClintock and Strong, 121.
Cyclopedia of Classified Dates, Little, 122.
Cyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 123.

D

Dakota, Wesleyan Univ., 139, 170.
Dallas, Texas, 165.
Dartmouth College, N. H., 172, 183.
D'Aubigné, 6, 90, 100.
Davenport, Iowa, 162.
Davey-Biggs, *Russia and Reunion,* 102, 266.
Davidson College, 172.
Davidson, Archb. of Canterbury, 102.
Davis, H. W. C., Ed., 203.
Dayton, Ohio, 156.
Dean of Canterbury, Wace, 282.
Deane, *The Reformation,* 233.
Dearmer, *Everyman's History of the Eng. Ch.,* 184, 233.
Death sentence, for forging bank notes, 97.
Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees, Von Döllinger, 106. 107.
Declaration of Independence, mistaking its date, 2.
Deer's Cry, St. Patrick, 173.
Denmark and Bishops of Winchester in 1268 and 1909, 281.
Denver, Colorado, 156.
Descriptive Lantern Lectures, Lane, 233.

Des Moines, Iowa, 165.
Detroit, Mich., 162.
Dewey, Melvil, 115.
Dickens, Charles, 43.
Dickinson College, Pennsylvania, 141.
Dictatus, 261.
Dictionary of Eng. Hist., 208.
Disestablishment and Disendowment: What Are They? By Prof. Freeman, 46, 47.
Disestablishment of the Eng. Ch., the issue, 277, 278, 281.
Distribution of Various College Text Books, 136-138, and fol.
Divorce of Catharine of Aragon, Froude, 30.
"Divorce" of Henry VIII., the issue, 99.
Divorce, with papal sanction, 87.
Dix, *Manual of Instruction,* 135.
Dixon, 83, 122, 123, 211.
Doctrine, Method of Settling, 164.
Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception B. V. M., 145.
Documents Illustrative of English Church History, Gee and Hardy, 147.
Dogmatic Theology, Hall, 134.
Döllinger, 50, 74, 108.
Donne, Dr. John, 69.
Dowling, *The Patriarchate of Jerusalem,* 266.
Dr. Pusey, G. W. E. Russell, 68.
Drummond, *James Martineau,* 197.
Dubuque, Iowa, 142.
Duchesne, 84-88, 90, 107, 206.
Duluth, Minn., 162, 165, 181.
Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America, Fiske, 22.

E

Earlham College, 142.
Eastern Church, 31, 45, 71, 103, 105, 116, 151, 152, 167, 200, 208, 222, 265, 267.
Ecclesia Anglicana, 142, 168.
Ecclesiastical Hist. of Scotland, Grub, 246.
Ecclesiastical Hist. of the British Nation, Bede, 146.
Ecclesiastical Law, Burn, 255, 258.
Ecclesiastical Law of the Ch. of Eng., Phillimore, 259, 260.
Edinburgh Review, 26, 53.
Edmond State Normal School of Oklahoma, 173.
Edward VI., 12, 37, 167.
Edward VI. and the B. of C. P., Gasquet, 81, 82.
Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Ch., Hore, 266.
Elementary Ch. Hist. of Great Britain, W. H. Hutton, Oxfd, Ch. Text Bk. series, 227.
Elements of Engl. Const. Hist., Montague, 184.
Elizabeth, Queen, 32, 36.
Elizabeth, suspicious and policies justified, 95 note.
Elmendorf, Mrs. H. L., 115.
Elmira, N. Y., 165.
Emery College, Georgia, 141.
Ency. Americana, 129.
Ency. Brittanica, 148, 206.
Ency. of the Laws of England, 253.
Endowments and Establishments of the Ch., Earl of Selborne (Palmer), 258, 198.
Endowments, source, 45, 46, 198, 253.
England, S. R. Gardiner, series *History of the Nations,* Ed. Lodge, 199.
England's Story, E. M. Tappan, 171.
England under the Tudors, Innes, 200.
Engl. Ch. Hist. for Children, Shipley, 233.
Engl. Ch. Hist., Plummer, 233.
Engl. Ch. in the Sixteenth Century, Gairdner, 219.
Engl. Ch. Pageant, 278, 283.
Engl. Historians, Prof. Grant, 16, 50.
Engl. Hist. for Americans, Higginson, and Channing, 123.
Engl. Historical Review, Lord Acton in, 50.
Engl. Hist. in American public schools, 7-9.
Engl. Hist. Stories, C. E. Merrill, pub., 184.
Engl. *Men of Letters,* Morley, 23.
Engl. Reformation, The, Hutton, 227, Geikie, 67, 190; Williams, 22, 86.
Engl. Ref., The, and the Book of Common Prayer, Wirgman, 214.
Engl. Ref. of the Sixteenth Century, Beckett, 198.
Engl. publishers' school books, 185.
Engl. Seamen, Froude, 35.
Epitome of Universal Hist., Ploetz 111.
Epochs of Ch. Hist., Ed. Creighton, 215.
Equality in a free state, Principle of, Chapters 1 and 20.
Era of the Prot. Ref., Seabohm, 83, 112.
Erasmus, 84.
Essays, Macaulay's, 17, 22, 23, 40.
Essays and Criticism, St. George Mivart, 82.
Essays in Biography and Criticism, Bayne, 23.
Essentials in Hist. Eng., Hart and Walker, 176.
Essentials in Hist., Medieval and Modern, Hart and Harding, 160.
Establishment of the Church, error regarding, 46, 47, 118.
European Background of Am. Hist., Cheyney, 154.
European Hist. an outline, Adams, 138.
Evans, A. W., 36.

Everyman's Hist. of the Engl. Ch., Dearmer, 233.
Evidences of Christianity, Ragg, 233.
Exactness of terms required, 152, 153, 169-171, 177, 179.
Exeter, Bishop of, reply to Macaulay, 18, in 1087.
Exposition of the Catechism, Ken., 208.
Exposition of the Creed, Pearson, 69.
Exposition of the XXXIX Articles, Browne, 128.

F

Fairbairn, Principal, 131.
Faith of our Fathers, Gibbons, 89, 90, 94, 98, 99, 163.
Faiths of Famous Men, Kilbourn, 240.
Fall River, Mass., 138, 165, 172.
Ferrar, Life and Times of Nicholas, Skipton, 234.
Field, *Confirmation* (Oxfd. Ch. Text Bk), 233.
First Christmas Tree, Van Dyke, 283.
First Steps in the Hist. of Eng., 166.
Fisher, Bishop, Acton on, 103.
Fisher, Prof. George P., 14, 40, 130.
Fiske, Prof., John, 22.
Fleming, Rev. D. H., 247.
Fletcher, *Introductory Hist. of Eng.*, 183.
Florence of Worcester, Forester, 147.
Forced Recruit, The, Mrs. Browning, cited by Lecky, 92.
Forde, *A Goodly Heritage*, 234.
Forester, *Henry of Huntington, Florence of Worcester*, 147.
Forged Decretals, 206.
Forgery, Sentence of Death for, 97.
Formosus, Pope, 86.
Fort Wayne, Ind., 181.
Foster, Rev. F. H., 128.
Francis, I., 59.
Francis Atterbury, Beeching, 27.
Franklin College, Indiana, 172.
Freedom, Principle of, 1, 219, 288-290.
Freedom, History of, etc., by Acton; see under H.
Freeman, Prof. E. A., 27, 41, 44, 52, 54, 62, 146, 154, 206, 252, 259.
Frere and Douglas, *Puritan Manifestos*, 149.
Frere, *Elizabeth and James I.*, 233.
Frere's Procter's, *Hist. of the B. of C. Prayer*, 153.
Friends, Society of, 22, 27, 209, 218.
Friends' University, Kansas, 173.
Froude, 30-38, 49, 50, 54, 83, 117.
Fulham, Residence of Bishops of London, 272, 283.
Fuller, *Life of Bishop Davenant*, 69.
Fulton, Rev. Dr. John, 131.
Furman College, South Carolina, 139.

G

Gairdner, 83, 122, 192, 201, 219, 222.
Gallican Church and Gallican Liberties, 110.
Galloway College, Arkansas, 173.
Galveston, Texas, 180.
Gardiner, S. R., 27, 36, 37, 48, 50, 154, 193, 198, 206.
Gasquet, Dom, 81, 105.
Gee and Hardy, *Documents Illustrative*, 147.
Gee, Dr. Henry, 96 note, 233.
Geikie, 67, 190.
General History, Barnes, 140.
General History, Myers, 168.
General Sketch of Hist., Freeman, 44.
Gibbon, 49, 54.
Gibbons, Cardinal, 89, 90, 93, 96, 97, 99, 100, 163.
Gibson, *The Three Creeds*, 234.
Giles, *Matthew Paris*, 147.
Gilman, Dr. D. C., late pres. Johns Hopkins U., 128, 129.
Gilpin, Rev. Bernard, 232.
Ginn & Co., Pub., 141, 153.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. W. E., 18, 20, 21, 28, 42, 74, 162, 179, 188, 236, 237, 243.
Gladstone, Macaulay's Essay on, 17.
Gladstone in Macaulay, 20.
Glastonbury, repurchase of the Engl. Ch., 275.
Gleanings of Past Years, Gladstone, 20, 42, 188, 238.
God in history, 6.
Goodly Heritage, A, Forde, 234.
Godwin, *A Catalogue of the Bishops of Eng.* and *Annals of Eng.*, 69.
"Good Friday Sermon, The," 84.
Gore, Charles, Bishop of Birmingham, 107, 109, 229, 277.
Gosse, Edmund, 15.
Government of Engl., The, Lowell, 253.
Grand Forks, N. D., 142, 170.
Grand Rapids, Mich., 142.
Grant, *English Historians*, 16, 50.
Gratry, Abbe, 109.
Great Falls, Mont., 156, 170, 183.
Gregory VII., Pope, 157, 261.
Gregory VIII., Pope, 97.
Greek and Eastern Churches, Adeney, 266.
Greek Ch., see under *Eastern*.
Green, J. R., 15, 38, 48, 50, 53, 58, 62, 83, 154, 193.
Greenville Coll., Ind., 172.
Grosetete, Bishop, 214.
Growth of British Policy, Sir J. R. Seeley, 110.
Growth of Papal Influence, 99 note.
Grub, George, *Eccl. Hist. of Scotland*, 246.
Guardian, London, 128, 222, 223, 267, 282.

Guerber, H. A., *The Story of the English,* 159.
Guest, *Lectures,* 176, 195.
Guidance in History, Chapter X.
Guilford College, 170.
Guizot, 142, 189, 190.
Gustavus Adolphus College, Minnesota, 141.
Guthrie, C. J., Ed., 246.
Guyon, historian, 96.

H

Haddon, 62.
Hale, Dr. E. E., 123.
Halifax, Lords, 19, 243.
Halki, Example of Reunion of Churches, 267.
Hall, Prof. F. J., 134.
Hallam, Const. Hist., 39-42, 166, other mention, 41, 49.
Hallam on Hume, 14.
Hallam, Macaulay's Essay on, 17, 22.
Hamline University, Minnesota, 175.
Handbook of Eng. Cathedrals, Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer, 119.
Handbook of Eng. Hist. Based on Guest's Lectures, 176.
Handbooks of Eng. Ch. Hist., Ed. J. H. Burn, 233.
Handbooks for Senior Classes, 247.
Hanover, House of, Lowering influence of, 78.
Harding, Prof. S. B., 160.
Hardwick, Charles, 60.
Harper's Book of Facts, 129.
Hart, Prof. A. B., Ed., 176.
Hartford, Conn., 159, 165, 169, 172, 179.
Harvard University, 183.
Harvey, *American Normal Readers,* 184.
Hastings, Warren, Macaulay's Essay on, 23.
Hausser, *The Period of the Ref.,* 111.
Hayden, *Dictionary of Dates and Universal Information,* 205.
"Head of the Church," 98.
Headlam, *History, Authority, and Theology,* 206.
Hedding College, Illinois, 141, 182.
Hefele, Bishop, 108.
Helena, Montana, 180.
History, Authority, and Theology, A. C. Headlam, D.D., Princ. Kings College, London, 206.
History Character, 5, 117, 136, 137, 153, 175, 250, 290.
History Difficulties, 3, 4, 74, 289.
History Study, 9, 10.
History Value, 5, 9, 289.
Hist. for Ready Reference, Larned, 121.
History of England—
Anderson, 138.
Andrews, 139.
Bright, 187.
Froude, 30, 32, 33, 34.
Hume, 11-16.
Larned, 162.
Lingard, 80.
Macaulay, 17-29.
Oman, 184, 200.
Powell and Tout, 193.
Terry, 172.
Thompson, 51.
Hist. for High Schools and Academies, Coman and Kendall, 156.
Hist. for Schools, Prof. Terry, 172.
Hist. from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, Froude.
Hist. in the Eighteenth Century, Lecky, 188.
Hist of Freedom, etc., Lord Acton, 20, 80, 90, 95, 104, 105, 188, 238.
Hist. of Medieval and Modern Europe, Prof. G. B. Adams, 138.
Hist. of Scotland, P. Hume Brown, 247. Prof. Henry E. Bourne, 140, 141.
Hist. of the American Ch., Coleman, 115, 116.
Hist. of the B. of C. Prayer. Pullman, 232; Maude, 217; Frere's Procter, 153.
Hist. of the Christian Ch. Prof. Fisher, 131; Bp. Hefele, 108.
Hist of the Christian Ch. During the Reformation, Hardwick, 60, 61.
Hist. of the Ch. of Eng., Hore, 213.
An Introduction to the, Wakeman, 116, 151, 154, 193, 217, 218.
From the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction, Dixon, 83, 122, 123, 211.
From the Death of Elizabeth, Perry, 215.
Patterson, 233.
Stapleton's Edition of Bede, 148.
Henry IV., 59.
Henry VIII., Notable Estimates of, 36, 43, 45, 59, 91, 103, 198, 200.
Henry of Huntington, Forester, 147.
Henry the Eighth and the Eng. Monasteries, Gasquet, 83.
Herbert, George, 55.
Heroes of the Nations, Ed. H. W. C. Davis, 203.
Hetherington, *Hist. of the Scottish Ch.,* 245.
Hibbert, Lectures, Beard, 133, 196.
Hierurgia Anglicana, 269.
Higginson, T. W., 123.
High Church, 34, 67, 158.
Hill, G. B., 22.
Historical and Political Essays, Lecky, 22.
Hist. Course for Schools, Freeman, 51.
Hist. Essays, Freeman, 46.
Hist. Essays and Studies, Acton, 41, 86, 87, 91, 103, 104, 215.

Hist. Lectures and Addresses, Creighton, 205.
History and Religious Faith, 5-7.
Hist. and the Roman Ch., 51, 89, and fol., 102, 104, 106-108.
Hist., Appeal to, considered Treason, 104.
Hist., Eng. and American, 7, 251, 252, 288.
Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland, Cunningham, 246.
Hist. of the Eng. Ch., Gairdner, 221.
Hist. of the Eng. Ch. During the Ref., Hardwick (Ed. by Stubbs), 60.
Hist. of the Eng. People, Green, 56, 154.
Hist. of the Formation and Growth of the R. E. Ch., Price, 150.
Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland. Calderwood, 246; Rowe, 246.
Hist. of the Nations, Ed. Dr. Henry Cabot Lodge, 199.
Hist. of the Papacy During the Period of the Ref., Creighton, 87, 202.
Hist. In the Nineteenth Century, Nielson, Bp. of Aalborg, 109.
Hist. of the P. E. Ch. in the U. S., Tiffany, 116.
Hist. of the Popes, Ranke, 97.
Hist. of the Ref., Burnet, 16.
D'Aubigne, 100.
Lindsay, 113.
Hist. of the Ref. and Ch. in Scotland, Stephen, 249.
Hist. of the Ref. in England, Perry, 215.
Hist. of the Ref. in Germany, Ranke, 248.
Hist. of the Ref. in Scotland, Knox, 246.
Hist. of the Scottish Ch., Hetherton, 245.
Hist. of the Scottish Ch., Cunningham, 246.
Hist. of Western Europe, Robinson, 170.
Hist. of the World, Ridpath, 118.
Hollis, *How the Ch. Came to Eng.,* 184, 234.
Holy Eucharist, The, T. T. Carter, 67.
Holy Orders, Whitham, 234.
Holy Spirit, 7.
Hook, Dean, 50, 72, 133, 209.
Hooker, 55, 73, 121.
Hope College, Michigan, 139, 165.
Hore—
Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church, 266.
Students' Hist. of the Greek Ch., 266.
The Ch. in Eng. from William II. to Victoria, 213.
Household of Faith, Russell, 73.
How Shall We Worship God? Butler, 67.
Howard College, Alabama, 165.
Howard, Lord, 35.
Howard Univ., 165, 170, 182, 183.
How the Ch. Came to Eng., Hollis, 184, 234.
Huguenots, 95, 97.
Hume, 11-16, 69.
Humphrey, Fr., S. J., 110.
Hurst, John F., D.D., 120, 126.
Hutton, *Letters of William Stubbs,* 6, 38, 40, 60, 62.
Hutton, W. H., *A Hist. of the Eng. Ch., Charles I. to Anne,* 222, 223.
Hutton, Ed. Ch. Universal series, 235.

I

Ignorance of History, 105.
Illegitimacy undermines the Roman hierarchy, 104.
Illinois College, Jacksonville, 182.
Illinois Wesley Univ., 140, 142, 183.
Illustrated Notes on Eng. Ch. Hist., Lane, 233.
Images in Churches, 32, 145, 150.
Immaculate Conception of the B. V. M., Doctrine of the, 145.
Index of Prohibited Books, 105.
Indexing, 153.
Indianapolis, Indiana, 180
Indiana State Normal School, Pennsylvania, 173.
Infallibility, dogma of, 106, 107.
Ingram, Bishop of London, 271, 284.
Innes, *Eng. Under the Tudors,* 200.
Innocent III., 56.
Inquisition, defended by the Pope, 106.
Introduction to the Eng. Historians, Beard, 50, 122.
Introduction to the Hist. of the Ch. of Eng., Wakeman, 116, 151, 154, 123, 217, 219.
Introduction to the Hist. of Western Europe, Robinson, 170.
Introductory Hist. of Eng., Fletcher, 183, 184.
Iowa, 173.
Iowa College, Grinnell, 139, 172, 182, 183.
Iowa State Coll., 172.
Italy, destr. ac. of monasteries, 84.

J

Jackson, Rev. S. M., Ed., 128.
Jacob, Bishop of St. Alban's, 98.
James II., 21, 110.
James Milliken University, 138.
Jamestown, Virginia, Bp. of London at, 271.
Jennings, Rev. A. C., *Ecclesia Anglicana: A Manual of Ch. Hist.,* 1898.
Jennings, Rev. A. C., *The Mediaeval Ch. and the Papacy,* 1909; 233.
Jersey City, N. J., 138, 141, 156, 162, 165, 168, 179, 180.

Jessopp, *A Penny Hist. of the Ch. of Eng.*, 233.
Jesuits, 16.
Jewel, Bishop, 68, 79, 132.
John, King, 56.
John X., Pope, 86.
John XI., Pope, son of Pope Sergius III., 88.
John XII., Pope, 88.
John XXIII., Pope, 87.
John Knox and the Ref., Lang, 248.
Johns Hopkins University, 172.
Johnson, Boswell's Life of, 22 (Hill's ed.), 25.
Joliet, Illinois, 173.
Joy, James Richard, 120.
Julius II., 84.
Justus, First Bishop of Rochester, 269.

K

Kansas City, Mo., 162, 168.
Keble, Rev. John, Senior, 79.
Keble, Rev. John, 79.
Ken, Bishop Thomas, 66, 71, 206, 208.
Kendall, Eliz. K., 156.
Kennedy, *Archbishop Parker*, 205.
Kensit, protest, 149.
Keokuk, Iowa, 162, 169.
Kilbourn, *Faiths of Famous Men*, 240.
King, Bishop of Lincoln, 79.
Kingdom of Christ, The, Rev. F. D. Maurice, 209.
King Over the Water, The, Shield and Lang, 110.
King Edward VI., Markham, 205.
Kingsley, Rev. Charles, 38.
Kirksville State Normal School, Missouri, 173.
Knight, *Popular Hist. of Eng.*, 43, 69.
Knox, John, *Hist. of the Rev. in Scotland*, 246.
Knox-Little, Canon, speech in Convocation, 282.
Kurtz, 111, 145, 178, 193, 206.

L

Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 183.
Lambeth Conference, 272.
Lancaster, *Manual of Eng. Hist.*, 161, 169.
Lancaster, Pa., 140, 162, 165, 169.
Lancelot Andrewes, Ottley, 69.
Lane, *Illustrated Notes of Eng. Ch.* 233.
Lane, *Descriptive Lantern Lectures*, 233.
Lanfranc, 45.
Lang, Andrew, 36, 37, 248.
Lang and Shield, 110.
Langton, 14, 259.
Larned, 121, 162.
Latane, Ref. Ep. Bishop, 150.
Lathbury, *Mr. Gladstone*, 238.
Laud, 20, 21, 27, 45, 162, 204.
L'Aveuir de Eglise Rouse, Wilbois, 102, 266.
Leaders of Religion series, 71.
Leaders of the Church, 1800-1900, 68.
Leading Facts of American Hist., Montgomery, 167, 184, 186.
Leading Facts of Eng. Hist., 165-167.
Leavenworth, Kansas, 139.
Lecky, 22, 92, 94, 188, 235.
Lectures and Papers on the Hist. of the Ref., Moore, 215, 251.
Lectures on Modern Hist., Acton, 100, 250.
Lectures on the Hist. of the Eastern Ch., Stanley, 266.
Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches, Von Döllinger, 106.
Lee, Prof. Guy Carleton, 121.
Lehigh Univ., 170, 183.
Leopold, late King of the Belgians, 91.
Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen, Knox, 95, 96, note.
Letters of John Richard Green, 57.
Letters of William Stubbs, Hutton, 6, 38, 40, 60, 62.
Letters to Mary Gladstone, Acton, 7, 36, 91, 95, 109.
Lewiston, Maine, 139, 169.
Libau, Russia, service, 267.
Liberal Religious Congress, 1907, 271.
Liberties, American, 4.
Liberty, 19.
Library of Congress, 116.
Library of Literary Criticism, Moulton, 14, 15, 27.
Library of Universal Knowledge, 125.
Life and Letters of E. A. Freeman, 27, 41, 45, 46, 49, 50, 52, 57.
Life and Letters of James H. Shorthouse, Shorthouse, 218.
Life and Letters of James Martineau, Drummond, 198.
Life and Times of Nicholas Ferrar, Skipton, 235.
Life and Works of George Herbert, Palmer, 55.
Life of Bishop Davenant, 69.
Life of Cardinal Manning, Purcell, 110.
Life of Froude, Paul, 36.
Life of Gladstone, Morley, 18, 20, 21.
Life of Macaulay, Morison, 23.
Life of Manning, Purcell, 110.
Life of Wesley, by Southey, 43; by Little, 178; Urlin, 178.
Lincoln, Nebraska, 139, 156, 170.
Lincoln Memorial Univ., 165.
Lindsay, *A Hist of the Ref.*, 113.
Lingard, 15, 50, 80, 163.
Lisieux, Freeman's letter from, 145, 146.
Litany, test of, J. R. Green, 54.
Literary Studies, Bagehot, 27.

Littell's Living Age, Boston, 24, 25, 26, 54, 153, 273.
Little, Rev. A. W., 178.
Little, Charles E., *Cyclopedia of Classified Dates,* 122.
Little Rock, Ark., 142.
Littledale, 193.
Liverpool, Kensit disorder, 149, 270.
Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, Hook, 50, 210.
Lives of Twelve Good Men, Burgon, 21.
Lives, Walton's, 66, 69.
Living Age, Boston, 24, 25, 26, 54, 153, 273.
Living Church, Milwaukee, 234, 266.
Locke, 19.
Lockhart, 27.
Lodygensky, Consul General, 266.
Lollardy and the Ref., Gairdner, 201, 222.
London, Bishop of, at New York, Richmond, and Jamestown, 271, 272; at the Pageant, 283.
London, Diocesan Conference, 1909, 284.
London, Sermon in, by Cardinal Gibbons, 97.
London Times, 43.
Lord Acton and His Circle, Gasquet, 105.
Lord Acton's Letters to Mary Gladstone, Ed. Paul, 7, 36, 91, 95, 109, 199.
Lord, Dr. John, 117.
Lord's Prayer, The, Refer to, at Reform., 31.
Los Angeles, Calif., 141, 142, 169.
Louisville, Kentucky, 141, 142, 180.
Low, S. J., Ed., 208.
Lowell, James Russell, 35.
Lowell, Massachusetts, 138, 156, 165, 168.
Lowell, President Abbott Lawrence, of Harvard, 253.
Lowrie, Rev. R. W., 135.
Luckock, Dean H. M., *Scotland,* 249.
Luther, 33, 83, 87, 90, 103.

M

MacCall, 74, 95, 108, 109.
Macaulay, 15, 17-29, 37, 40, 41, 50, 54, 69, 90, 100, 117, 121, 136, 154, 188.
Mackintosh, *The Story of Scotland,* 248.
Macleane, *Our Island Church,* 21, 39.
Madison, Wisconsin, 142, 156, 162.
Magna Charta, 14, 41, 142, 166, 250, 259.
Magna Carta, A Commentary, McKechnie, 251.
Mair, Rev. W., Moderator, General Assembly Kirk of Scotland, 264.
Maitland, Prof. F. W., 192.
Makers of History, Abbott, 118, 119.
Makers of National Hist., 205.
Making of Eng., J. R. Green, 56, 57.
Makower, Felix, 111.
Manchester, N. H., 142, 169, 267.
Mangan, J. C., translation of St. Patrick, 174.
Manning, Cardinal, 84, 104, 107, 110.
Manual of Eng. Hist., Lancaster, 161.
Manual of Historical Literature, Adams, 9.
Manual of Instruction, Dix, 135.
Map of Life, Lecky, 188, 235, 236.
Mariana, Spanish historian, 94, 95 note.
Marietta College, Ohio, 173.
Marion, Indiana, 173.
Marion, Michigan, 173.
Markham, Sir Clements R., *King Edward VI.,* 205.
Marlborough, 19.
Marozia, 88.
"Marquise de Fontenoy," 117.
Marriage of Roman Clergy, 85.
Martineau, Harriet, 27.
Martineau, Dr. James, 197, 198, 258.
Mary Stuart, 110.
Mary Tudor, 12, 109.
Maryland Hist., 97.
Mason, Canon, 109, 281.
Mass, The, 12, 15, 55, 74, 84, 126.
Mass, whether it was abolished:
  Affirmative, Chs. II., III., IV., V., pp. 35, 80, 81, 101, 139, 154, 182, 187, 189, 195.
  Negative, pp. 74, 81, 82, 113, 199.
Massacre, St. Barthol., 94, 97, 105.
Mathew, Bishop (Old Catholic), 85.
  tr. Duchesne, q. v.
Matthew Paris, Giles, 147.
Maynard, *Eng. Classics,* 28.
Maude, J. H., 216.
Maurice, Rev. F. D., 209.
McCarthy, Justin, *Gladstone,* 237.
McCarthy, Prof., 126.
McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature,* 124.
McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, 113.
McKechnie, *Magna Carta, A Commentary,* 251.
McKeesport, Pa., 165.
McKim, Rev. Dr. R. H., 97.
Medal Com. Massacre of St. Bartholomew, 94.
Medieval and Modern Hist., Adams, 138, 168.
Mediævalism, Fr. Tyrrell, 107.
Mediæval and Modern Hist., Meyers, 169.
Medley, *Students' Manual of Eng. Const. Hist.,* 99, 184.
Mellitus, Bishop of London, 269.
Meriden, Conn., 156.
Merrill's *Eng. Hist. Stories,* 184.

Miami Univ., Ohio, 170, 173.
Michaelmas, 1850, birth of R. C. Ch. in Eng., 110.
Michigan Ag. Coll., 172.
Michigan State Normal School, 173.
Midland Coll., Kansas, 141, 172.
Milton, 16, 20.
Milwaukee, Wis., 162.
"Minister," use of the word, 34, 132.
Ministerial Priesthood, Moberly, 85.
Ministry of Grace, Wordsworth, 7, 86.
Minneapolis, Minnesota, 9, 180.
Minnesota, Univ. of, 141.
Mississippi Coll., Clinton, 141.
Missouri, 173.
Missouri Wesleyan College, 173.
Mitchell, Dr., *Scottish Ref.,* 248.
Mivart, St. George, *Essays and Criticisms,* 82.
Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood,* 85.
Moderator, Scottish Presbyterian General Assembly, Dr. Mair, 264.
Monroe, Dr. Paul, *Text Book in the Hist. of Education,* 164.
Montague, *Elements of Eng. Const. Hist.,* 184.
Montgomery, D. H., 138, 165, 179, 184.
Monticello, Illinois, 173.
Moore's Hill Coll., Indiana, 172.
Moore and Brinkman, *Anglican Brief,* 193.
Moore, Rev. Aubrey L., Deputy Prof., 215, 251.
Moral Law does not progress, 91.
More, Sir Thomas, Acton on, 103.
Morehouse, *Some American Churchmen,* 244.
Morison, J. Cotter, *Life of Macaulay,* 23.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John, 18, 20, 21, 23, 28, 237.
Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa, 182.
Morris, Prof. Chas. S., Ed., "Twentieth Century Cyclopedia," 125.
Morton, Bishop, 79.
Mother of All Churches, Cole, 268.
Moulton, *Library of Literary Criticism,* 14, 15, 27.
Mount Union College, Ohio, 172.
Mowry, A. M., 168.
Mullinger, Prof. J. B., 192.
Murphy, Edgar G., 47, 48.
Myers, Prof. P. V. N., 168.

N

Nashua, N. H., 142, 156, 162, 169, 170, 181, 183.
National Ch. Russia, 103.
National Ch., series, 249.
National Ch. in *Contemporary Review,* 198.
Nebraska, Wesleyan Univ., 139.
Nelson, Bishop of, 21.
Nelson, Robert, 67.
Nelson's Encyclopedia, 208.
Newman, Cardinal, 109, 110.
New Bedford, Mass., 142, 162, 165, 183.
New Century Book of Facts, Carroll D. Wright, 126.
New Eng. Teachers' Association, 250.
New English Dictionary on Historical Principles, 206, 208.
New Hampshire, 10.
New Haven, Conn., 165, 168, 169, 176.
New International Ency., Ed. Dr. D. C. Gilman, 128, 129.
New Orleans, La., 168.
New Primary Hist. of Eng., Mrs. Cyril Ransome, 191.
New Theology and the Old Religion, The, Gore, 229.
New York City, 156, 165.
New York State Library, 116.
New York Sun, 97, 189.
New York University, 182, 183.
New York World Almanac, 137.
Newberry College, South Carolina, 165.
Newboldt, *The Sacrament of the Altar,* 234.
Newell's *St. Patrick,* 173.
Newton, Mass., 138, 139, 156, 170, 183.
Nielsen, Dr. F., Prof. and Bishop, 109.
Niemeyer, 196.
Nightingale, A. F. Ed., 181.
Niver, H. B., 169.
Norman Conquest, Freeman, 50.
North American Magazine, 100 note.
North Carolina State Normal and Ind. College, 138, 165, 170.
Northwestern Territory S. N. S., Oklahoma, 173.
Northwestern University, 142.
Novuissimo Melzi-Dizionario Complete, Pub. Villardi, 81.
Nye, G. H. F., 263.

O

O'Donovan, Rev. L., Tr. of Henry VIII.'s *Assertio Sep. Sac.,* 190-191.
O'Reilly, John Boyle, Incident in his Life, 92.
Oakland, California, 162.
Oates, Titus, 19.
Obedience and Ordinations as a Witness to Catholic Continuity, 288.
Oberlin College, and Theological Seminary, 128, 183.
Ogden, Utah, 162.
Ogg, *Source Book of Med. His.,* 161, 261.
Ohio State University, Columbus, 139, 182, 183.
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, 141.
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, 138, 182, 183.

Old Eng. Hist., Freeman, 44.
Oldroyd, *The Continuity of the Eng. Ch.*, 230, 259.
Oliver Cromwell, by Theodore Roosevelt, 19.
Omaha, Nebraska, 163.
Oman, *A History of Eng.*, 184.
Open Letter to Cardinal Gibbons, Sabatier, 100 note.
Orange, House of, Influence on Church Appointments, 78.
Orders and Unity, Gore, 229.
Ordination Addresses, Stubbs, 60.
Oriental Church, see Eastern.
Original Letters rel. to the Eng. Ret., 74.
Origin and Evolution of Christian Worship, Duchesne, 84.
Origin and Growth of the Eng. Const., Dr. Harris Taylor.
Ottley, *Lancelot Andrewes*, 69.
Ouachita College, Arkansas, 173.
Our Island Church, Macleane, 21, 39.
Outline Hist. of Eng., Joy, 120.
Outlines of Christian Dogma, Darwell Stone, 230.
Outlines of Church Hist., Mrs. C. H. Smith, 118.
Outlines of the World's Hist., Swinton, 171.
Oxford Church Text Books, 233.
Library of Practical Theology, 234.
Movement, 74.

P

Pacific University, Oregon, 173.
Paddock Lectures, 22, 86, 134.
Pageant, The Eng. Ch., 283.
Pall Mall Magazine, 272.
Palmer, Prof. G. H., *The Life and Works of George Herbert*, 55.
Sir Roundell, 198, 257.
William, 74.
Pan-Anglican Conference, 2.
Panigarola, Preaches in Praise of Massacre, 94.
Papacy, 12, 13, 14, 86, 87, 106, 109.
Parker, Archbishop, 57, 61, 132.
Parker Society, *Original Letters*, 74.
Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism, Smyth, 114.
Paterson, N. J., 159, 165, 169.
Patriarchate of Jerusalem, Dowling, 267.
Patrick, Saint, 173.
Paul, Herbert, 36.
Pawtucket, Rhode Island, 156.
Pearson, Bishop, 69, 79.
Peck, Prof., 128.
Pembroke College, Cambridge, A. J. Mason, Master of.
Penn, William, 22, 27.
Pennsylvania State College, 170.
Penny Hist. of the Ch. of Eng., Jessopp, 233.
Period of the Reformation, Hausser, 111.
Perry, *Hist. of the Ref. in Eng.*, 215.
Persecution, 97.
Persinger, Prof. (Caldwell and P.), *A Source Hist. of the U. S.*, 184.
Phanar, Example of Unity of the Churches, 267.
Philadelphia, Pa., 162, 165.
Philip II., 59.
Philip and Mary, Prof. Mullinger, 192.
Phillimore, Sir R., 258.
Pilgrim's Progress, Bunyan, 23.
Pinnock and Southward, *An Analysis of Eng. Ch. Hist.*, 233.
Pittsburgh, Pa., 138.
Pius IV., Additions to Creeds, 106, 127, 170.
Pius V., Pope, 95, 96, 261.
Pius IX., 84, 106, 110.
Ploetz, 111.
Plummer, *Eng. Ch. Hist.*, 233.
Plumtre's *Thomas Ken*, 66.
Pole, Reginald Cardinal, 57, 103, 104.
Political Essays, James Russell Lowell, 36.
Pollard, Prof. 36, 191, 192, 199.
Popular Hist. of Eng., Guizot, 142, 189.
Popular Hist. of Eng., Knight, 43.
Popular Hist. of the Ch of Eng., W. Boyd Carpenter, 116, 233.
Portland, Maine, 156, 162, 165.
Portland, Oregon, 141, 156.
Portraits of the Archbishops of Canterbury, Bevan, 233.
Portugal, America given to, 109.
Position of the Eucharist in Sunday Worship, Abraham, 67, 233.
Powell and Tout, 192.
Prayer Book, The, Official Statements, 243.
Presbyterian Statement, 264.
Presbyterian Board of Publication, 113.
Price, Mrs. A. D., 150.
Priest, Use of the Word, 68, 69, 71, 119, 132, 152, 155, 189.
Primitive Saints and the See of Rome, Puller, 108.
Princeton, University, 27, 114.
Pritchett College, Missouri, 139.
Procter, *Hist. of the Book of Prayer*, 153, Ed. Frere, 153.
Property Rights; Eng. Churches, 18, 45, 46, 101, 167, 263.
Protestant, The word, how used, 39, 66, 148, 254.
Protestant Ref., Seebohm, 112.
Protestantism, 102, 115.
Protestation of 1788, Allen, 110, 262.
Prothero, Dr. G. W., 62, 247.
Providence, R. I., 162, 165.
Pueblo, Colo., 139.
Pullan, *Hist. of the B. of C. Prayer*, 232.

Pullan, with Wakeman, *The Ref. in Great Britain,* 219.
Puller, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome,* 108.
Pulling, Prof. F. S., Ed., 208.
Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning,* 110.
Purdue University, 142.
Puritan Manifestos, 149.
Putnam, George P., Ed., 128.
Putnam, *Hist. of the Index of Prohibited Books,* 105.

Q

Quakers, See Friends.
Quarterly Review, 25, 26.
Quilter, Henry, 209.
Quincy, Illinois, 179.

R

Racine, Wis., 162.
Ragg, *Evidences of Christianity,* 233.
Randolph, Thomas, 79.
Ranke, 96, 97, 100, 163, 248.
Ransome, Cyril, 190, 191.
Ransome, Mrs. Cyril, 191.
Reading, Pa., 165, 168.
Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, 15, 73, 76, 214, 217, 218.
Recent Growth, The, Stretton, 2.
Real Presence, See under Cranmer, Gladstone, Hume, Russell, Carter, Nelson, etc.
Reformation, Hist., A Living Issue, 9, 10.
Ref. Period, The, Dr. Gee, 233.
Ref., The, Deane, 233.
Ref., The, Fisher, 14, 40.
Ref., The, Whitney, 235.
Ref. of the Ch. of Eng., Blunt, 212.
Ref. in Great Britain, Wakeman and Pullman, 219.
Ref. Settlement, The, MacColl, 74, 95, 108, 109.
Reformed Episcopal Ch., The, Mrs. A. D. Price, 149, 150.
Reign of Elizabeth, Froude, 30.
Reign of Henry VIII., Brewer, 91.
Relics, 32.
Religio Medici, Browne, 65, 66.
Religious Freedom and Equality, 1.
Religious Value of Hist., 6, 7.
Renton, A. Wood, *Encyclopedia of the Laws of Eng.,* 253.
Reply of the Eng. Archbishops, 269.
Reunion Conference, Bown, 107.
Revolution, The Age of, Hutton, *Ch. Universal* series, 235.
Rhyl Ch. Congress, Archbishop Benson's words, 281.
Richey, Prof. Thomas, 135.
Ridley, Bishop, 76.
Ridpath, *Hist of the World,* 118.
Right of the Ch. of Eng. to her property, 18, 45, 46, 101, 167, 263.
Riley, Athelstan, 282.
Ripon, Bishop of, *A Popular Hist. of the Ch.,* 116.
Ripon College, Wisconsin, 172.
Roanoke College, 156.
Roberts, R. E., *The Ch of Eng.,* 233.
Robinson, Prof. J. H., 170.
Rochester, Eng., Justus, First Bishop of. Bishop in 1087.
Rochester, Eng., 100th Bishop. 1300 Anniversary.
Rochester, N. Y., 165.
Roger, De Hovenden, 147.
Roger of Wendover, 147.
Rollins University, Wisconsin, 141.
Rollins College, Florida, 165.
Roman Catholic Church, The Name, 161, 164, 256.
Roman Cath. Claims, Gore, 107, 109, 229.
Roman Cath. Sanction for Robbing English Monasteries, 82.
Roman Ch. in Eng., 110.
Roman Ch., Modern Attitude to Greek Ch., 102.
Romanes, Mrs., *Charlotte Mary Yonge,* 52.
Rome, See 11, 15.
Roosevelt, Theodore, *Oliver Cromwell,* 19, 116.
Roosevelt, Theodore, on Macaulay, 19.
Roper, Prof. J. C., 133.
Rottenburg, Bishop Hefele of, 108.
Routh, Pres. M. J., 21, 79.
Row, John, *Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland,* 246.
Royal Historical Society, 62.
Royal Supremacy, 98.
Ruffhead, O., *Statutes at Large,* 251, 255, 257.
Ruoff, *The Century Book of Facts,* 126.
Russell, Dr. Pusey, 68, *Collections, Recollections,* 109.
Russell, *Life of Gladstone,* 240.
Russell, Lord, 19.
Russell, *The Household of Faith,* 73. 79.
Russia and Reunion, Davey Biggs, 102, 103, 266.
Russian Ch., 102.

S

Sabatier, *An Open Letter to Cardinal Gibbons,* 100.
Sacrament of the Altar, The, Newbolt, 235.
Sacramento, Calif., 177.
Saginaw, Mich., 162, 182.
St. Alban, 138.
St. Alban's, Bishop of, see Jacob, Dr.
St. Angela College, New Rochelle, N. Y., 170.
St. Anselm, 144.
St. Bartholomew's Day, Massacre of, 94, 97, 105.

St. Bernard, 33.
St. Boniface, 283.
St. Botolph, 286.
St. John's Coll., Annapolis, Md., 165.
St. Joseph, Missouri, 162.
St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y., 183.
St. Louis, Missouri, 168.
St. Michael's Mount, 221.
St. Patrick, 173, 174.
St. Paul, Minnesota, 138, 173.
St. Peter's Ch., Rome, Building of, 90.
St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y., 182, 183.
St. Thomas Aquinas, 33.
Saintsbury, Prof. George, 15.
Salem, Mass., 165, 183.
Salisbury, Lord, 179, 246.
San Antonio, Texas, 141, 142.
San Francisco, Calif., 162, 177.
Sanderson, Bishop, 70.
Sanseverina, Cardinal, 97.
Schaff-Herzog Encyc., 128.
Schism, 115.
School Hist. of Eng., Niver, 169.
Schools, American, Purpose of, 2-5, 8-10, 28.
Scott, Foresman & Co., Publishers, 172.
Scott, Sir Walter, 249.
Scotland, 84, 86, 164, 245-249.
Scottish Authorities on the English Ref., 112.
Scottish Authorities on the Scottish Ref., 245.
Scottish Ref., Mitchell, 248.
Scranton, Pa., 170, 177.
Scribner's Magazine, 48.
Scripture, The Holy, see *Bible*.
Seabury, Memoir of Bishop, Seabury, 245.
Seattle, Wash., 138, 141, 180.
Seebohm, 83, 112.
Seeley, Sir J. R., 110, 187.
See of Rome, 11, 15, 86, 87, etc.
Selborne, Earl of, 198, 257.
Select Documents of Eng. Const. Hist., Adams and Stephens, 147.
Seminarian, 134.
Sergius II., Pope, 87.
Sergius III., Pope, 86, 87, 88.
Seventeen Lectures, Stubbs, 6, 8, 10, 22, 42, 50, 57, 59, 96, 105, 117.
Seymour, May, 115.
Shaftesbury, 19.
Sheboygan, Wis., 181.
Shield and Lang, *The King over the Water*, 110.
Shipley, Mary E., *Eng. Ch. Hist. for* Children, 184, 233.
Short Hist. of the Christian Ch., Hurst, 120.
Short Hist. of the Ch. in Great Britain, Hutton, 227.
Short Hist. of the English People, Green, 50, 56, 154.
Short Hist. of Eng., Cheyney, 141, 156.
Short Studies on Great Subjects, Froude, 31, 33, 34.
Shorthouse, J. H., on Wakeman, 218.
Side Altars, 145.
Sidney, A., 19.
Silver, Burdett & Co., *American Normal Leaders*, 184.
Simpson College, Iowa, 172.
Sioux City, Iowa, 162.
Sitka, Alaska, Russian Bishop of, 266.
Six Old Engl. Chronicles, Giles, 147.
Skelton, 36.
Skipton, *Life and Times of Nicholas Ferrar*, 235.
Smith, Prof. Goldwin, 54, 188, 189; Mrs. C. H., 118.
Smyth, Rev. Dr. Newman, 115.
Social England, Traill, 205.
Social Result of the Suppression of the Monasteries, 83.
Some American Churchmen, Morehouse, 244.
Some Test Questions, 127.
Somerset, 52, 75.
Somerville, Mass., 156, 165.
Sorbin, 94.
Source Book of Engl. Hist., Lee, 122.
Source Book of Mediæval Hist., Ogg 161, 261.
Source Hist. of the U. S., Caldwell and Persinger, 184.
South Bend, Ind., 181.
Southern Education Board, 47.
Southern University, Greensboro, Alabama, 165.
Southey, *Book of the Ch.*, 42 43; *Life of Wesley*, 43.
Spain, America given to, 109.
Spanish Armada, 34.
Spender, Harold, 273.
Springfield, Ill., Ambassador Bryce at. 237; Books used, 10, 142, 173.
Springfield, Ohio, 181.
Spokane, 139, 142, 162.
Standard Dict. of Facts, 126, 127.
Standard Works, Ed. Whittingham, 182.
Stanley, *Lectures on the Eastern Ch.*, 266.
Stapleton's Bede, 148.
State in its Relations with the Ch., The, Gladstone, 239.
State Normal Schools, 141, 162, 168.
State University of California, 141.
State University of Kentucky, 170.
State University of Iowa, 173.
Statutes at Large, 251, 255, 257.
Steele, Drs. J. D. and E. B., authors of *Barnes' General Hist.*, 140.
Stenton, F. M., *William the Conqueror*, 203.
Stephen III., Pope, 88; Stephen VI., Pope, 86.
Stephen, Leslie, 28, 57.

Stephens and Hunt:
Hist. of the English Ch., 233.
Life and Letters of E. A. Freeman, 27, 41, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 57, 62, 72, 146, 206, 251.
Stone, Rev. Darwell, 230, 276.
Story of Scotland, Mackintosh, 248.
Story of the English, Guerber, 159.
Story of the Ref., d'Aubigne, 6.
Story of the Spanish Armada, etc., Froude, 31.
Story, Prof. R. H., 248.
Stretton, *The Recent Growth*, 2.
Stories from English Hist., Warren, 179.
Strafford, Earl of, Hume on, 14.
Strong, Dr. Josiah, 123.
Stubbs, *Const. Hist.*, 5; on Hallam, 40, 42.
Stubbs, *Letters of*, 16; on Froude, 38. other mention, 49, 54, 59, 60, 62, 63, 117, 122.
Stubbs, *Seventeen Lectures*, 6, 8, 10, 22, 36, 42, 50, 57, 96, 105.
Students' Hist. of Eng., Gardiner, 199.
Students' Hume, 15, 16; *The Greek Ch.*, Hore, 266.
Students' Manual of English Const. Hist., Medley, 99, 184.
Studies on the Eng. Ref., Williams Paddock Lectures, 22, 86, 134.
Study of Ecclesiastical Hist., Collins, 22, 100.
Study of Hist. in Schools, Am. Hist. Assoc., 8.
Sunday Movement, Archbishop's address, 270.
Sun, The, New York, Dr. McKim in, 97; Prof. Goldwin Smith in, 189.
Supremacy, Royal, 98.
"Supreme Head of the Ch.," Mary's title refused by Elizabeth, repealed 1 and 2, Mary, 98.
Swedish Historians, 265.
Swinton, *Outlines*, 171.
Syracuse, N. Y., 165, 169, 177, 183.

T

Tagliahie, Fr., Gladstone's letter to, 242.
Talks About Autographs, Hill, 22.
Talladega College, Alabama, 162.
Tappan, Eva M., 171.
Taunton, Mass., 142, 165, 169, 172.
Taylor, Dr. Hannis, 100, 251, 252.
Te Deum, Ordered by Pope for St. Barth. Massacre, 94.
Teachers, Public School, 1-4, 10, 28. 55, 74, 83, 107, 112, 136.
Temple College, 142, 169, 170.
Ten Epochs of Ch. Hist., Ed. Rev. John Fulton, 131, 133.
Tennessee, 173.
Tennyson, *The Princess*, quo., 5.
Terry, Prof. Benjamin, 96 note, 172, 193.
Testing Religion, 53, 79.
Texas, 173.
Text Book in the Hist. of Education, Dr. Paul Monroe, 164.
Text Books used in American Colleges and Schools, 136-184.
Text Books used in English Schools, 185, 186.
Theodora, 88.
Theodore of Tarsus and Canterbury, Founder of Ch. of Eng., 56, 120, 122.
Thirlwall, 48, 49.
Thirty-nine Articles, 118.
Thomas Cranmer, Pollard, 37.
Thomas Ken, Plumtre, 66, 71; Clarke, 71.
Thompson, Edith, 50.
Thompson, Rev. Henry, 72.
Three Creeds, The, Gibson, 233.
Tiffany, Rev. C. C., *History Am. Ch.*, 115.
Tillinghast, William H., Translator Ploetz, *Epitome*.
Times, London, 43.
Toffteen, Rev. Prof. O. A., 265.
Toledo, Ohio, 142.
Tolerance, 19.
Toleration, in Maryland, 97.
Tracts for the Times, 68, 69, 72, 218.
Traill, *Social Eng.*, 205.
Translations and Reprint from the Original Sources., C. of Pa., Ed. Cheyney, 147, 152.
Transylvania University, 139, 142, 156, 162, 169, 170, 173.
Treatise on the Ch., Palmer, 74.
Treble, E. J., 81.
Trinity College, Durham, N. C., 182.
Troy, N. Y., 165.
Tübingen, Prof. Hefele of, 108.
Tulane University, 142, 170.
Twentieth Century Encyc., 125.
Twentieth Century Quarterly, 36.
Twenty Centuries of Eng. Hist., Joy, 120.
Tyrrell, Rev. George, S. J., 107.

U

Ultramontane, 127.
Undercurrents of Ch. Life in the Eighteenth Century, Carter, 72.
Underwood, F. H., 116, 195.
Unitarian writers, 196-198.
United Kingdom, A Political Hist., Prof. Goldwin Smith, 188.
United States Military Academy, West Point, 170.
Unity of American and Eng. Hist., 7-9, 251, 252, 288.
Universities, Northwestern University, 142.

University of—
Arkansas, 173.
Chicago, 172.
Cincinnati, 141, 142.
Colorado, 139.
Denver, 139, 162, 183.
Iowa, 172.
Kansas, 182.
Michigan, 182.
Minnesota, 141.
Missouri, 139, 141, 142, 162, 170.
Nebraska, 141, 142, 182.
Nevada, 162.
North Dakota, 142.
Notre Dame, 169, 170, 183.
Pennsylvania, 139, 142, 183.
Pittsburg, 139, 183.
Richmond, 141.
Texas, 173.
The Smith, 139, 182.
Virginia, 141.
Washington, 183.
Wisconsin, 142.
Urbana University, Ohio, 165.
Urban II., Pope, 107.
Urlin, R. Denny, *Life of Wesley,* 178.
Ursinus College, Pennsylvania, 139, 141.
Ussher, Archbishop, 68.
Usurpations, Papal, 99, see Law (Ch. XVII.).
Utica, N. Y., 165.

V

Valparaiso University, 138, 183.
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., 138, 139, 170.
Van Dyke, Dr. Henry, 283.
Van Rensselaer, Mrs. Schuyler, 119.
Vaughan, Cardinal, 110.
Vestments, Meaning and Associations, 282.
Vicksburg, Miss., 165, 169.
Victorian Literature, Andrew Lang, 37.
Vincent, J. H., 123, 126.
Vindication of the Ch. of Eng., Bull, 70.
Virginia, 173.
Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 170.
Visitation Charges, Stubbs, 60.
Von Döllinger, 105, 106.
Von Ranke, 96, 97, 100, 163, 248.
Vrie, D., 87.

W

Wabash College, Indiana, 172.
Wake Forest College, North Carolina, 162.
Wakeman, 116, 151, 154, 193, 217-219.
Wakeman and Pullan, *The Ref. in Great Britain,* 219.
Wales, Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Ch. in, see Asquith, Benson, Freeman.
Walker, Albert Perry, 176.
Walton's Lives, 66, 69.
Warham, Archbishop, 61, 86.
Warren, Henry P., 179.
Warrensburg, S. N. S., Missouri, 173.
Washburn College, Kansas, 141, 170.
Washington, D. C., 162, 165, 170.
Washington and Lee University, 173.
Washington College, Tennessee, 165, 183.
Waymarks in Ch. Hist., Prof. W. Bright, 108.
Wayside Sketches in Eccles. Hist., Bigg, 95.
Welsh Ch. Legislation, see Asquith, Freeman, Rhyl.
Wellesley College, 170, 173, 183.
Wells Diocese, 1000th Anniversary, 286.
Wesley, Rev. John, 178.
Wesley, Life of, Little, 178; Southey, 34; Urlin, 178.
West, Prof. A. M., 180.
Westcott, *Catholic Principles,* 74.
Western Ch., 31, 51, 52, 57, 71, 105, 112, 113, 151, 195.
Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio, 172.
Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, 138, 139, 140, 170, 183.
Westminster College, Fulton, Missouri, 183.
West Virginia University, 172, 173, 182.
What is the Catholic Ch. in Eng., Browne, 230.
What's What, 209.
Wheaton College, Illinois, 183.
Wheeling, West Virginia, 165, 169.
Whitby, Council of, A. D., 664, 56.
Whitehead, Benj., *Church Law,* 256.
Whitham, *Holy Orders,* 234.
Whitney, James P., *The Reformation,* 235.
Whittingham, Bishop of Maryland, 69.
Wilbois, L'Avenir de l'Eglise Russe, Trans. Davey-Biggs, 102, 266.
William, Jewell College, Liberty, Missouri, 139, 172, 173.
William of Malmsbury, Giles, 147.
William the Conqueror and the Rule of the Normans, Stenton, 203.
William the Norman, 146, 157.
Williams, John, Bishop of Connecticut, 22, 86, 134.
Williams, G. Mott, Bishop of Marquette, 272.
Williamsport, Pa., 156, 162, 165, 169, 183.
Wilmington, Delaware, 140.
Wilmington, North Carolina, 165, 169.
Wilson, Bishop, 79.
Wilson College, Pennsylvania, 162.
Wilson, Woodrow, Pres. of Princeton University, 27.

Winnington-Ingram, Present Bishop of London, 79.
Wirgman, A. T., 213, 214.
Witchcraft, 127.
Wittenburg College, Springfield, Ohio, 172.
Wolsey, Cardinal, 86, 88, 103, 104, 113, 193.
Woodrow, Society, 246.
Worcester, Mass., 162, 165.
Words for the Church., Murphy, 48.
Wordsworth, John, Bishop of Salisbury, 7, 86.
World's Progress, An Index to Universal Hist., Putnam, 128.
Wright, Carroll D., 126.
Wrong, Prof. G. M., 181.
Wyclif, 122.

Y

Yale University, 138, 139, 172, 182, 183.
Yonge, Charlotte M., 51, 52, 184.
Yonkers, N. Y., 169.
York, Lang, Archbishop of, Enthronement, 278.
York, Pa., 181.
Young Folks' Hist. of Eng., C. M. Yonge, 52.
Youngstown, Ohio, 165, 168.
Ypsilanti, Mich., 173.

Z

Zenos, Rev. A. C., 113.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00076276